

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

No. 10.]

OCTOBER 1, 1823.

[VOL. V.]

Religious Communications.

For the Christian Spectator.

*On the Moral Influence of Learning
and Literary Pursuits.*

(Concluded from page 453.)

BEFORE answering the question, which closed the article in the last, "What are some of the habits of mind which a studious life is fitted to produce, and what is their influence on the character?" it may be proper to remark, that it is the design of this communication not so much to compare the moral tendency of literary pursuits with that of others, as it is to point out some moral dangers, and more briefly the safeguards—that thus the novice may learn to suspect when he is exposed, and see where his safety lies. These dangers vary with the character of the minds engaged in these pursuits: and while some are peculiar in their kind; others are so only in degree, being shared to some extent by several classes in society.

A studious life may produce an injurious effect on the character, *by not calling sufficiently into exercise, the moral powers.* It appears to be a law of our nature, that an exclusive cultivation of any one mental faculty gives it an undue predominance over the others, and that just in proportion as the others are neglected, do they lose their power over the mind. Thus the man who for a long time has been accustomed to direct his attention solely to present and external objects of perception, finds it difficult to fix his thoughts upon subjects of abstract speculation, or upon his

own mental operations; while on the other hand, the man who for a long time has confined his attention to the faculties of his own mind, or to abstract principles, finds a difficulty in fixing it upon external objects and occurrences. The reasoning faculty, by an exclusive cultivation, acquires an undue ascendancy over the rest, and makes the mind resemble that of a celebrated philosopher, who having read a beautiful poem very gravely asked, "And what does it prove?" The poet introduced him into a world to which he had been a stranger, and among all the bright forms of fancy he could not recognise an old acquaintance. So the man who has fostered his imagination to the neglect of his other mental powers, finds that he has given it such an entire dominion over his soul, that to seek for truth in the way of demonstration, costs an irksome and painful effort of the mind. He has strayed so long in the scenes of fiction that the sober realities of life have not a charm for him. He has obeyed the suggestions of fancy,

till to the visionary seem
Her day-dreams truth, and truth a dream:

Now this same law of our nature extends to our moral powers, and gives them strength or weakness, according as they are exercised, or lie dormant. If devotedness to learning has a tendency to call them into exercise, and so to invigorate them that they shall have their due influence, compared with the other powers of the mind, it is, in this respect, not

unfavorable to moral excellence. Some branches of learning undoubtedly have a tendency to wake our moral feelings into exercise, and while they are giving a proper stimulus to the intellectual powers, and fitting them up with their appropriate furniture, they at the same time give a corresponding activity and influence to the moral powers, and thus prepare the man for the better performance of relative duties, and those which he owes to himself and his God. But there are other branches,—and these too are numerous, since the sciences in modern times have been so much subdivided,—that engage and employ one class of faculties to the entire neglect of the other. And as we look over the wide field of knowledge which has been so much enlarged by the labors and the discoveries of the learned, and see how great a part is devoted to the cultivation of those subjects, that involve no moral feelings,—as we look at the extensive science of the mathematics in its several parts—at the wide range of subjects comprehended under the term ‘natural science’—at the interminable extent of metaphysics—at many of the topics of history and philosophy,—we can easily believe that a student may spend a life in speculative research, without subjecting his mind to the influence of those truths and motives, which might keep in operation his conscience and the affections of his heart. He may be “quick to learn and wise to know,” and yet have suffered his moral nature to languish in inaction, until his conscience may become slow in discerning his duty, and his affections sluggish in their movements, until he becomes a “mere reasoning machine”—a “bundle of metaphysics”—a depository of facts—a “moving Lexicon.” Bring before his mind the great truths of religion, his accountability to God, the strictness of the divine law, his condition as a sinner, his exposedness to punishment, and although he admit the truth of your statement, in a vague and indistinct

manner, the impression made upon his feelings is likewise vague and indistinct, soon to be erased by the habitual current of his thoughts.

But even if he should turn his attention to those subjects that are connected with the exercise of his moral feelings, still *unless he is able to unite action with feeling, he will not make rapid proficiency in moral improvement.* It is a fine sentiment of Cicero, in his lately discovered work, “nec vero habere virtutem, satis est, quasi aliquem artem, nisi utare. Et si ars quidem, cum ea non utare, scientia tamen ipsa teneri potest; virtus in usu sui tota posita est.” Virtue—christian virtue is active in its very nature. It does not consist in mere passive good wishes, or in fruitless intentions, or even in the lofty musings of the enthusiast; but in the love of doing good and in actually doing it when there is an opportunity—in exercising proper affections toward God in his several attributes, and toward our fellow-men in their various relations, as kindred, neighbors, as members of the same community, or as children of the same common father, and in actually performing the duties corresponding with these affections. Now these affections cannot be felt in their strength and the corresponding duties cannot be performed, without actual intercourse with men and a personal inspection of their condition and wants. What we see with our own eyes affects us strongly compared with what we hear; for we see it in all its attending and minute circumstances, whereas we hear of it only in general terms, which convey no very distinct image to the mind, and therefore produce comparatively a weak impression. He who has frequent intercourse with mankind in the various relations of life, will frequently be in those scenes that will awaken his sensibilities to both the joys and miseries of his race, and in the active discharge of his duties, he will, if he is rightly disposed, gather increased good-will towards them.

It is a law of our nature, to feel increased love to the individuals whom we have benefited; and the christian too, while he is engaged in his labors of active benevolence, while his mind dwells upon the objects of his sympathetic regards; whether they demand his counsel, his prayers, or his influence and services; feels a deeper interest and livelier affection for them, and thus while he is helping all, he acquires a stronger love for all—that love towards his brother whom he hath seen, indicative of love to God whom he hath not seen.

It is indeed very possible to look out from the “loop holes of retreat,” on the great world through the medium of books, and gather some just views of the real condition and wants of our race, and under the influence of these views to warm into a generous philanthropy. It is very possible in one’s closet to weep over the miseries of man in various climes, shut up, as he is, in the darkness of ignorance, bound down by the chains of tyranny, and trembling under the influence of horrid superstitions; and while weeping it is very possible, not only to pray fervently and contribute largely for their temporal and eternal welfare, but likewise to feel strong desires to be engaged personally in the sublime enterprise of rescuing a world from misery and sin—to emulate the bright example of Howard in his errand of love through Europe, or the brighter example of Paul in his higher errand through the nations. Now all this justness of views, and all this correctness of feeling, and all this strength of desire is compatible with a small portion of self-denial which animated the two moral heroes just mentioned. It is not indeed worthless in the sight of man or God, yet it cannot be compared in value with the tried virtues of active service.

The life of the christian is represented as a warfare, in which he is to meet a constant succession of spiritual enemies which demand not only his vigilance to guard against surprise; but all the strength of resolu-

tion to defend himself against their open attacks. So numerous and so powerful are they in the scenes of busy life, that some have considered the contest as hopeless, and from absolute cowardice have retired from the field,

“And quit a world where strong temptations try,
And since ’tis hard to combat, learn to fly.”

Whatever may be the effect of retirement, in preventing the perpetration of vice, or in reforming those who are actually vicious, and thus furnishing the soul with those negative virtues that consist in a freedom from sin; it cannot compare with active life in the developement and exhibition of the higher virtues. Nor is it certain that by retreating from the world, you will secure yourself from positive sin. “Resist the Devil and he will flee from you.” Dare boldly to oppose him, as he meets you in the path of duty; and with the heaven-descended shield of faith, and the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God—arms that like the heavenly-tempered ones of Æneas, can neither be pierced, nor withstood—and with the animating presence of your leader, and with the crown of glory before you, fear not for the issue. Every victory will give you fresh strength, whereas by fleeing from your spiritual enemies, and thus inverting the command, you will often give them an advantage over you which they will not fail to use. Undoubtedly there have been those who from their closets have been eminently useful—more so perhaps, owing to a peculiarity of character, than if they had come out and mingled more in society. When we look at what Cowper did with his pen, and his peculiar turn of mind which unfitted him for public life; when we see what Addison did by his periodical writings, and what he did not do as Secretary of State; when we call to mind that Bacon in his study changed the whole face of philosophy, while his conduct in a public station

showed him, if not "the meanest of mankind," at least disqualified for acting his part with honor—we shall not feel inclined to push every man onto the theatre of active life.

Still, however, we are to remember, that all have not those strong tendencies of character, and that with respect to most men, created as they are for action, retirement is not fitted to call out those talents which are necessary in order to be eminently useful, or to cultivate those affections that are necessary to arrive at high attainments in moral excellence, because it does not present the proper objects upon which to exert them, and proper motives to call forth exertion.

Whenever a studious life as it sometimes does, begets too strong a relish for retirement, and thus gradually produces an incapacity for moving in the scenes of activity, when it creates too strong a love for books, and weakens the sympathies for the family of man, when it produces an unnatural predilection for meditation, and an aversion to directing the attention to external objects of perception—we may then fairly say that its influence upon the character in regard to morals and religion is unfavorable. The individual may be free from vice, and yet be destitute of those virtues to which every man should aspire; and as was said of Galba, "*ipsi medium ingenium, magis extra vitia quam cum virtutibus.*" That this is not its necessary influence we may see by referring to many examples in our own and in former ages, of those who have been ardent in their devotion to the muses, who nevertheless have preserved a strong attachment to social intercourse, and who have come forth from the closet with hearts of benevolence towards mankind, with enlarged minds, and with those habits of feeling and thought that have enabled them to act a distinguished part on the theatre of life.

Another habit of mind, from which danger is to be apprehended, is that which is formed by an *exclusive at-*

tention to the exact sciences. It seems to be a law of Providence that the corruption of the best things becomes the worst. These sciences, some of which have very properly been styled "*Καθαρματα Ψυχης.*" *Purifiers of the soul*, though of great use in preparing the mind for the examination of moral evidence, may have the effect to completely disqualify it for that examination. They are built on the solid basis of axioms and definitions, and they stand in the strength of demonstration, like some Doric Temple, and impart to their votaries a corresponding strength of intellect. They exhibit truth in the clearly defined lineaments of absolute certainty, and thus enable the student, by being acquainted with her form, to discover her in whatever drapery she may be arrayed. Upon certain minds they seem to produce a different effect, partly perhaps from the original constitution of those minds, and partly from being too exclusively pursued. The mode of reasoning is not the same in mathematical and in moral subjects, and it not very unfrequently happens that an individual will show himself a giant in the one class, and a pigmy in the other. The proof of many truths in morals and religion is not to be found in a regular chain of self-evident propositions arranged in the order of premise and conclusion, but in several disconnected considerations. And it may therefore happen, that an honest seeker after the truth may, from his previous habits, be dissatisfied with the latter mode of proof even when it ought to produce conviction, and when he finds that it is impossible to draw forth the truth by stretching a subject on the rack of demonstration, that he should conclude that it cannot be discovered. Accustomed to the clear light of certainty, all is darkness to him in the region of probable evidence, or if the light of truth is seen, its rays are so feeble and uncertain that they do not serve to guide him in faith or practice.

Another source of danger may be

found in the *cultivation of taste*. To shorten the length of this article, I will refer the reader to an able essay on the subject by Foster, showing the reasons of the aversion of men of taste to evangelical religion.

But it is not merely from unfortunate habits of mind that danger is to be apprehended. The young student as he casts a delighted look over the wide field of knowledge, which he fondly hopes to make his own, little suspects that the Protean form of Infidelity has been introduced into all its departments. If he applies himself to the study of History, he is perhaps not aware that two of the three best English historians, and others equally eminent in other nations, endeavour to recommend it by every art that ingenuity can devise, or industry employ. Some writers of this class, not satisfied with oblique remarks against christianity, and dark hints and adroit statements of facts, and elegant sarcasms, which like a polished weapon, sink the deeper for being polished, take a bolder stand, and inform him that it is evident from facts, that every religion is supported by superstition or enthusiasm or both; that mankind exhibit the same devotedness of feeling, the same sincerity of purpose in their service, with respect to a God of their own formation, that they do, for the Saviour Christ Jesus; that they exhibit the same zeal and courage in contending, and the same fortitude in suffering, for the one as for the other. They tell him that a man appeared in Judea eighteen centuries ago, who like a great many impostors, professed to be commissioned from God, and to enforce his claims by miracles; that from a natural love of the marvellous, he acquired many disciples; that he tried a successful enforcement upon the credulity of mankind; and that a religion thus established, has been the means, in the hands of the statesman and prelates, of furthering their ambitious schemes.

The Geologist is ready to furnish

facts to show, that the formation of the earth does not correspond very well with the statements in Genesis; and from organized remains and the different strata of earth and the appearances around Volcanoes, he endeavours to show

“That he who made it, and revealed its date

“To Moses, was mistaken in its age.”

The Physiologist is ready to show that the soul depends on the body for its continuance, that commencing at the same time, it is so intimately interwoven with it that through life it is affected by whatever affects the animal organization, and that at death the soul ceases to exist. He talks of the “education of the brain,” and avers that all those active principles of our nature which render man the monarch of this lower world and teach him to aspire to something after death,—are owing to a peculiar conformation of matter, and when dissolved by death, can never be re-united.

The Metaphysician has endeavoured to infuse the subtle poison of infidelity into the fountains of reasoning. He declares with all the gravity of philosophy, that the distinction of right and wrong is founded wholly in human opinion; that all that we do is a part of the divine constitution and therefore must be right in the sight of God, however it may be in our own views; that the miracles upon which rests the christian religion, must be rejected, because universal experience is paramount to human testimony; that “a conscientious belief, or a conscientious disbelief of the truths of religion are no more matters of censure or praise, than the colour of the skin or the faculties of the body.”

There are men who spend their lives in collecting arguments against christianity, and in arranging these arguments in such a manner that they will make a deep impression on the mind. The history of learning furnishes melancholy proof that men endowed with the greatest genius, have, under the influence of a cor-

rupt heart, cultivated that genius, only that they might leave the world less happy than they found it, that they might by their influence cast over the world a cloud of deep darkness, and shut out the hope of a happy eternity. They were giants in talents, and like the Titans of old, they brought up the force of their great abilities against heaven and its friends. They have employed all the research of antiquity, all the analogies of nature and art, and all the acuteness of the Logician in originating and stating their arguments; and having thus prepared themselves, they have explored every avenue of the human mind, through which their own opinions might be introduced. Some address the reasoning faculty, and professing to use only the heavy weapons of argument they employ all the arts of ratiocination and in this way endeavour to gain those who take reason for their guide. Others use only the arms of wit in their conquests, and sending forth their missiles they attempt to overwhelm every old-fashioned truth of scripture which the reader may chance to hold. Others address the taste, and understanding well the power of association in controlling the opinions of men, they exhibit religion, and the friends of religion, in a connexion of ideas fitted to degrade it in the mind, while at the same time they captivate the imagination by presenting some splendid and baseless theory of their own. We have then before us an ample source of temptation to the student. He will often, from his habits of life, meet with works like those alluded to above, and as he often sees opinions hostile to christianity, brought forward with the calmness of assurance, stated with gracefulness of expression, defended by great ingenuity of reasoning, aided by the resources of learning, and the whole coloured over by the splendours of a highly cultivated imagination, need it seem surprising that his confidence in revelation should be insensibly weakened, until he should give up his opin-

ions into the hands of his author? that the star of Bethlehem, whose mild light once shone to cheer him in his passage over the troubled ocean of life and which he hoped would be his guiding star to heaven, should be shorn of its beams, shrouded in darkness; and his mind quitting its hold on sound principles, and torn from the anchor of its hope, should drift darkling upon the rocks of error? Such an one was known by the writer of this article. He was a man of taste and refinement, of a vigorous mind, stored with a variety of information—but unhappily deeply read in this false philosophy. The men whom he followed were thoroughly versed in all the arts of sophistry, and were able to lay the foundation of their reasoning so deep in the human mind, that it requires superior sagacity, to descend below it, and see that it is supported by error. He professed a desire to know the truth, but following such guides, he was bewildered in the mazes of deceptive reasoning, and while he thought himself advancing into the temple of truth, he was really winding his way into a labyrinth of error. He said while conversing on the subject of a future state of existence, and he spoke with an earnestness which secured belief:—"I feel that there is a future state. When I look around I see all aspiring after happiness, without attaining it; when I see the virtuous struggling with want and sorrow, and the vicious surrounded by enjoyments, I feel that there is another world where this desire and capacity for enjoyment can be filled—where virtue is rewarded and vice punished. But reason says no—philosophy says no—I feel the need of something to sustain me in my sorrows, for I have been unfortunate, and I long to believe that there is a place of happiness reserved for me—but it is all a dream." By deserting common and received principles, and trusting to a refined and deceptive mode of reasoning, he deserted religion and threw himself into the

arms of a cold and cheerless infidelity.

The force of *authority* without any examination, may exert an unfavorable influence. Every student has his favorite author. Chance made him acquainted, and acquaintance made him a friend; and in friendship, faults of principle are easily pardoned and adopted. He has followed his favorite as a guide through the mysteries of science, or he has explored with him the various departments of classical learning, or in his company he has strayed over the gay field of fiction. Now it is impossible for him not to love the man who introduced him into the bower of the Muses; who walked with him by the waters of Helicon, and who led him up to the "sacras origines," the first principles of knowledge; who taught him to admire whatever is grand in science, and to glow as he gazes at the forms of classic beauty. He respects his judgment in weighing and arranging evidence, his genius in the combination of his thoughts, his taste in discovering whatever is grand or lovely in art or nature. Having learned from him how to think and how to act, having found his opinions correct on a great variety of subjects, he ultimately places implicit confidence in all his opinions; or if a doubt should spring up in his mind in regard to the correctness of some of the opinions of his favorite author, he is prone to feel like him who said he had rather "err with Cato, than be right with the rest of mankind."

Another danger is found in that *examination into the principles of belief and action*, which every man of a reflecting mind makes with respect to himself. All, when young, are dependent on others for their principles, and most, receiving them in their education, carry them along through life, never giving themselves any deep concern whether they are true or false. They were taught to consider them as true, and having long acted on the supposition of their truth, they pass along through life as

sacredly believing them to be true, as if they were the result of demonstration. Now this large class who are willing to take their opinions upon trust, very often are under the influence of correct moral feelings derived from these opinions, and not unfrequently they make extensive attainments in piety. They hold much truth in their opinions though they cannot see its foundation, and even in their errors they find strong motives to holiness. God has taken good care of the interests of morals and religion, and has not made their existence dependent on enlarged and correct views; and though he has suffered the current opinions of society to be debased by the alloy of error, he has still preserved truth enough in these opinions to awaken virtuous feelings and action. As was suggested, there are some who are not willing to rest satisfied with a blind adherence to the general opinions of society, though they have themselves long acted on these opinions; but proceed to examine their foundation and structure, and to ascertain whether they rest on error, and whether they have been rightly composed. There is always some hazard in the experiment, lest when the opinions have been resolved into their first principles, they should never be re-organized; lest the elements of thought, being reduced to a state of chaos, the mind should not have sufficient power to assemble and arrange them in order and beauty. With respect to the young the danger is greater; for they are more rapid in forming conclusions, and having discovered that some of a certain class of opinions are incorrect, they are hurried on, by the mere force of analogy to the inference that *all* of this class are incorrect. The student will almost of necessity be led to the foundation of his opinions, and he will almost as a matter of course, discover that some of them rest on mistake, and discovering this in regard to moral and religious sub-

jects, he is in danger of placing the whole system connected with them, under the same condemnation. The light that breaks in upon his mind from one part of the system, may dazzle him, and disqualify him to judge in regard to the other parts. He rejoices in his newly acquired knowledge, and with excited feelings he hurries on to the most dangerous and sweeping conclusions, and while he exults in his emancipation from the thralldom of prejudice, he in fact is its votary and victim.

There is moreover a *pride of reason* which disdains to adopt common opinions, merely because they are common; which prefers soaring in a region of error, to the humble office of digging in the mine of truth. The philosopher, though possessed of the best intentions, is too apt to cast contempt on the opinions of the many—forgetting that these opinions may be correct, though the arguments that support them are wrong—that a line of conduct may be right, though the person who pursues it has no motive but prejudice or custom. The young adventurer in learning, finds something fascinating in breaking away from the prejudices of education and custom, and deserting a system which he may think is too narrow for his free spirit to move in. There is something fascinating in coming out boldly in opposition to the notions of the vulgar, though sanctioned by gray antiquity—in proclaiming the independence of reason—in declaring himself her champion—in urging others to rally around her standard and win the prize of truth, or at least to die as a moral martyr in her cause. He may have heard points of religion very unimportant in themselves, insisted upon as indispensable to salvation. He may have seen superstition assume the name of religion, and make the mind still narrower than its natural dimensions. He may have listened to the cant of bigotry, or have witnessed the extravagances of enthusiasm. Possessing a discriminating mind, and perceiving these

things to be the offspring of error, he concludes that every thing that bears the name of religion, has the same parentage. Instead of separating the gold from the dross, he pronounces it all dross. Besides, there are many things in religion which lie altogether beyond the scope of the human mind, and he may scorn to receive them as truth on the word of God, unless he is able to comprehend them in all their bearings and relations, and, adopting the sentiment “Religion ends where mystery begins,” he casts away all regard for some of the most important doctrines of revelation, because he is unable thoroughly to comprehend them.

Another source of danger is found in a *love of discussion*. It is hardly possible to spend much time in the investigation of subjects of any kind without acquiring a fondness for investigation in the way of discussion. In addition to the advantage of confining the mind to one side of the subject in assembling and arranging the evidence, while it is the business of the antagonist to assemble the evidence on the other side; there is likewise all the advantage of the excitement of debate, and the increased activity which opposition gives to the intellectual powers. It is not difficult for a man of ingenuity and learning to show himself superior to a plain and uneducated man; and there is danger that from a love of display and a love of discussion, he may be tempted to choose the wrong side of an argument, and to advance sentiments which he knows to be false—that he may exhibit his skill in making ‘the worse appear the better reason.’ There is danger that he may learn to love victory rather than truth in religion; and to advance what is specious in debate rather than what is convincing, that he may have the barren pleasure of a triumph over the feeble arguments of a feeble antagonist. There is danger that he may be meshed in the net which he had twined for others,—that from a habit of defending principles which

he believed to be false, and from a love of consistency, he may find himself entangled in the web of his own sophistries, until at length he becomes wedded to opinions fatal to his peace, to which at first he only pretended an attachment.

The last source of danger to be mentioned is that which is found in the *extensive perusal of the popular works of the day*. Some of these works are intentionally opposed to religion and its duties; and as they are written with ability and contain much that taste may admire and even virtue approve, as their professed object is to amuse, they are read without any suspicion of their real tendency. A large class of the wits of the present as of past ages, are opposed to the religion of the gospel, and though they would admit into their creed a refined species of naturalism, they are in their souls hostile to the humbling doctrines of the cross. They are men of pleasure who are able to paint with the hand of genius the scenes in which they themselves are conversant. Adopting the sentiment of Voltaire, "Monsieur Abbé, I must be read," they employ themselves in presenting the most fascinating objects of temptation; in kindling to a consuming flame those passions that are too apt of themselves to glow in the youthful breast. Let a writer of fine powers spread before the ardent fancy of a young person those bewitching scenes of pleasure, in which a voluptuary revels; let him summon beauty, and the power of song, and the sprightly dance, and the glowing looks of excitement, and the unconstrained expression of feeling, and the meeting of hearts expanding in rapture; and he cannot fail to call forth a kindred feeling, and a strong desire to take a part in those scenes which thus were in description able to reach the deep chords of sensibility in his heart, and call forth the thrilling notes of joy: or let the writer single out some individual of splendid and attractive talents but destitute of principle, as the hero of his tale; and carry him in all the

Vol. V. — No. 10

triumph of successful vice, through the progress of his work, and then dismiss him to happiness; and the reader will, as he has his sympathies strongly called forth, at first pardon his vices, and then consider them as the certain indication of spirit, and then imitate them in their associated beauty. His taste for moral excellence will become gradually vitiated until he ceases to value virtue in himself or others. Writers of this class have not only a powerful influence upon the affections directly and the conduct, but likewise upon the principle of belief, in regard to what is true in religion or right in morals. For by exhibiting vice in her fascinations; whether she presides at the festive board, or circulates the cup, or deals the cards, or leads the revel, or beckons the voluptuary; and by kindling warm wishes in the heart to share in these guilty pleasures, the understanding becomes disqualified for detecting the sophisms by which the claims of virtue are set aside; and opinions thus adopted in the moments of excitement and passion become the sober principles of belief and action through life.

After having thus glanced at some of the moral dangers connected with literary pursuits, it was the design of the writer to exhibit some of the safeguards against irreligion and vice which these furnish. The subject, however, has grown so much under the pen that it has become necessary to reduce the last part to a narrow compass, and the only apprehension is, lest the danger may stand out in too full a light, and have influence to deter any from entering upon a course of life, which though it may present some embarrassments, nevertheless offers many facilities in the cultivation of moral excellence. Every mode of life has its peculiar temptations, and it is the belief of the writer, that if the student meets with more in his path than some others, he likewise is presented with stronger motives to perseverance and more assistance in his encounter with his spiritual enemies. And it should be

observed that it is often the fact that when he is most exposed, then he is able to rear around him the strongest bulwarks, and that when learning leads him into contests that may prove fatal to his principles and his soul, she at the same time, furnishes him from her own armory with weapons of tried temper. And whether we look at their tendency as a whole, by examining their individual and in this way their conjoined effect, or at facts, and the character of those who have trodden the walks of learning, our friends need not fear an impartial decision. There is, as was said, danger that the intellectual powers may be cultivated to the neglect of the moral; yet as a matter of fact, moral science is so connected with the others, that it almost necessarily receives some share of the attention and contributes to the improvement of the moral perceptions and feelings: and though it should be thought, that the systems of education pursued aim too exclusively at the cultivation of the understanding while the *georgics* of the heart are neglected, it should still be remembered that many studies necessarily call into exercise our best moral feelings and insensibly exalt the mind to the perception and admiration of whatever is great or attractive in virtue. And the worst that can happen is not so much the depravation as the dormancy of virtuous affection.

But even if these affections should be called into exercise, there is still danger from a contracted love of solitude that they will not eventuate in the correspondent virtuous actions. In our country, however, there is not so much to fear from this quarter as in those where the necessity of engaging in a professional life is less urgent and where the distinctions of rank throw barriers in the way of familiar intercourse between men of congenial minds. The young when first smitten with the charms of literature, may dedicate themselves entirely to the service of their mistress, and from the modesty of youth or excessive sensibility, or from hat

low tide of spirits which study produces in those of a nervous temperament, they may feel too strong an inclination to retire from the scenes of active life. When, however, they are afterwards forced to come forward and act that part before the world in the various forms of professional business, they generally exhibit very little disgust for the scene, or very little inclination to retire until they are pushed off the stage by their successors. Too great devotedness to the accurate sciences may have an injurious effect on the mind, but it should be remembered that within certain limitations they are of great service in preparing it for the examination of subjects of a religious nature and that many who have been distinguished in the walks of philosophy and mathematics have likewise been distinguished for their knowledge as theologians, and devotion as christians. A highly cultivated taste may be disposed to turn away from many of the duties and truths of religion because they are connected with what is mean and grovelling, and because they are not connected with those actions and sentiments that have been consecrated to the muses. Yet religion too has its attractions for the man of taste, and while it presents all that is lovely in goodness, and all that is grand in power, in the most graceful and impressive forms,—he finds his heart touched with considerations to which others are strangers.

The danger arising from the dissemination of infidel principles has become less since the French Philosophy has lost its respectability, and it is pleasing to see that those who make the highest pretensions to learning and justly in the sciences, shew a willingness to admit the truth of the Christian religion, and not unfrequently come forth as the bold defenders of its principles. “Philosophy baptised in the pure fountain of Eternal Love,” becomes the daughter of Heaven, and wins the youthful student away from the sordid pursuit of a temporary existence, and leads

him upward towards the everlasting city, and reveals its glories in the distance, and supplies him with every facility for his progress. He is indeed liable to have his course darkened by doubts, and so are others; and if he has cultivated the true philosophy, if he has with care ascertained the limits of human reason and formed a proper estimate of its power, he will be guarded from scepticism on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the other, and thus moving on under the influence of fixed principles, he will arrive at higher degrees of holiness and real dignity of character than others. Being on his guard against the temptations to which he is exposed, and using every facility for his progress, he will as he ascends the hill-side of science and finds it "so smooth, so green, so full of goodly prospects and melodious sounds on every side that Orpheus' harp is not more charming," likewise find that every step in his ascent raises him nearer heaven, and gives him a fuller view of its glories.

AN OBSERVER.

For the Christian Spectator.

On Lay Presbyters.

No. 1.

FORMS of civil government are conventional, except where the social compact has been excluded by the dictation of power, or perverted by the stratagems of fraud. But in the kingdom of Christ, laws, ordinances, and offices are all prescribed and adjusted with precision; innovation is disobedience; an unauthorised office is insubordination and rebellion. The commission, and duties of the gospel-herald are spread upon the same pages of that word which he is to preach; that he may know his own obligations, and the people, how he is to be regarded. Offices erected in the church, after the removal of inspired men, are unlawful, whether in ancient or modern times. If such offices can be justified on the

conjectural ground of convenience, so may ordinances, and we may "teach for doctrines the commandments of men." Unity of design and operation, and especially the prevention of sinful competitions and disorder, justified presbyteries, in determining that one of their number should preside in their sessions, and in public worship. But for the ordination of a presbyter, or the ordination of any as lay presbyters, without apostolical precept or example, neither right nor power existed; and every such unscriptural office was and is merely void.

That no such commission under that dispensation whereof Christ was a minister, belongs to gospel times, will be conceded by those for whom I write; and that the commissions of apostle and evangelist, given by him after his resurrection, for the planting of the churches, being obviously temporary, have expired, may be at present also assumed. Our purpose is to show from facts what permanent offices at first existed in every regularly constituted church; that we may ascertain whether the term *presbyter*, πρεσβυτερος, was, among the first christians, understood to designate two offices, a preaching and ruling elder, or one only,—whether the epithet *ruling*, πρεσβυτης, was so far from importing subordination, that it was adopted to signify a presiding authority,—and whether becoming permanent at the close of the second century, this office, founded on mere expediency, was more usually expressed by the word επισκοπος, *bishop*, common before that period to all *elders*. If these things shall be made clear in this, and the papers which may follow, the assumption of the existence of two offices, couched under the same term, and constituted by ordination, but deemed to be distinct merely because presbyters exercised a diversity of duties in their episcopal character,* will be evinced

*Phil. i, 1. Acts xx, 17—28. Heb. xiii, 17. I. Pet. v, 1.

to be merely gratuitous and unsupported.

Although the opinions and practice of the fathers can have not the least authority to establish any office or doctrine, any prerogative or duty, not taught or exemplified in the Sacred Scriptures, yet their understanding of the Scriptures, without superseding the duty of thinking for ourselves, is entitled to our respectful attention ; and their testimony, where unperturbed, may prove that an office or order was in use in their times ; or their silence may, under circumstances, establish, as far as a negative is capable of proof, that none such was then in existence. Where the genuine work of a pious father represents a doctrine, or an office to have been common, when he wrote, his testimony is credible, that the thing, which he asserts, was at least the fact as far as *he* knew. But if the opinion of such father, or the practice of the church in his day, must be admitted as authoritatively obligatory, though not founded on the word of God, then indulgences can remove sin, and a wafer become the body of Christ ! The utility of their testimony is compatible with the admission that most of the christian fathers, of whose writings we have any more than fragments, have left melancholy proofs of weakness and error ; the conflicting opinions also of councils, equally disprove their infallibility.

The meaning of a law is often discoverable from the the first practice, which obtained under it. If the *ruling elders*, of which some modern divines have dreamed, were a grade of officers in every church, between preachers and deacons, such fact ought to appear in the early uninspired christian writers. If it should not be discovered upon a fair investigation, the silence of antiquity will be conclusive against the existence of such an office. Those who inveigh against clerical aggrandizement, as a modern substitute for original simplicity, and denounce episcopal power as an unscriptural inva-

sion of the privileges of the pastoral office, ought never to plead expediency, when they degrade the presbyterial, which is the only episcopal order, by reducing presbyters to the standing of deacons. The present appeal shall be to facts supported by undeniable testimony.

The ancient miserable production, by many ascribed to Barnabas, but deemed spurious by Eusebius, has not touched our subject. "The Pastor" supposed to have been written by Hermas, whom Paul mentions, was certainly not earlier than the middle of the second century. A translation only has survived ; from this the non-existence of the intermediate order might be easily argued ; but our proofs shall be drawn only from books of indisputable genuineness.

The excellent Clement, whose name Paul pronounced to be in the book of life, is by the voice of antiquity the author of a letter, which is the most, if not the only credible uninspired christian production of the first century. Its caption purports a letter from the church at Rome to the church at Corinth ; the contents are a persuasive and pious address, well designed to produce submission to the government of their elders, whom they had rejected. There is not a hint in the letter, either of an individual bishop, or of subordinate presbyters at Rome, Corinth, or elsewhere. Had there existed a superior officer at Corinth, this letter in defence of the presbyters must have recognized his authority ; had there been lay elders, the total silence of the letter on that point is wholly unaccountable.

That the elders, mentioned in this epistle, are of the same order, appears continually : "Let the flock of Christ enjoy peace, with *its elders*, *πρεσβυτερων*, appointed over it :"^{*} It is a shame that "the church of the Corinthians, on account of one or two individuals, should rise against *their elders*, *πρεσβυτερους* :"[†] "Our

* Chap. 54.

† Ch. 46.

apostles knew from our Lord Jesus Christ, that contention would arise about the honor of the *oversight*, ἐπισκοπῆς. On this account, having perfect foreknowledge, they constituted those before mentioned; and they appointed in succession, that when they should die, other approved men should accept that sacred office. That those should be ejected from their public ministrations, who were ordained by them, or afterwards by other excellent men with the consent of the whole church, and who have ministered blamelessly to the flock of Christ with humility, peacefulness, and intelligence, and with universal approbation for a long time, we think to be unjust. For it would be a great sin in us, if we should cast off those who have performed the functions of the *episcopate*, ἐπισκοπῆς, blamelessly and holily. Blessed are those *elders*, πρεσβύτεροι, who have finished their course, who have obtained their complete and happy discharge, for they have no fears, lest any shall remove them from the place assigned as a mansion to them.* These *elders* held the *episcopate*; were the bishops, presbyters, or leaders† of that church; were in every instance named in the plural, and, beyond all question, ranked in the highest order of the ordinary officers of a christian church.

The original organization of churches is particularly shown.‡ The apostles, “preaching through regions and cities, χωρας και πολεις, set apart their first fruits, having proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons εἰς ἐπισκοπους και διακονους of those who should believe.” Had the word *presbyters* been here substituted for bishops, lay-elders might have been alleged to have been comprehended; but the word is not here generic; nor can it be appellatively taken. The word *set-apart*, καθεστανον, fixes upon it an official sense. Also

the expression χαῖα χωρας και πολεις evince that the presbyters in the *region of country*, and in the *cities*, the chorepiscopi and episcopi; were at the first of one grade, and the individuals of equal authority. The supposition that either a superior, or an intermediate grade of officers, is omitted in this enumeration, is not merely to charge the writer with a careless inattention to an important fact, but to impeach his veracity; for if the first converts were set apart to three orders, they were not to two, for a portion of them constituted a third. That his language was designedly exclusive, appears also from his justification of this apostolical two-fold distribution, by a passage in Isaiah; “I will constitute their bishops in righteousness, and their deacons in faith.”* Thus does this letter positively affirm to the church at Corinth, that their presbyters, whose government they had renounced, were all *bishops*, ἐπισκοπους, both by apostolic ordination, and prophetic authority. Should any allege, that this prophecy was misunderstood, our argument is still safe, because the opinion of the writer is clear, and he must have given the officers of a christian church, as they then existed. Thus nothing can be more evident than that this letter, which, above all other uninspired productions, is of the highest authority, and at the earliest period, being prior to the Revelation of John, does use πρεσβύτερος and ἐπισκοπος for the same order and office, and allows them but one ordination only; and, as it is in the face of those lordly powers, which bishops afterwards claimed, *jure divino*, over presbyters; so it is a standing and perpetual testimony against those, who would degrade the office of the presbyter, to the mute ministrations of a modern *ruling elder*; which is but another name for a deacon, and in a large proportion of the American presbyterian churches, (whose opinion on this point has

* Chap. 44.

† Chap. 1. “υπολαττομενοι τοις ηγουμενοις υμων.”

‡ Chap. 42.

* Isa. lx, 17. פקדו he renders ἐπισκοπους, and שׂוֹמְרֵי διακονους.

been protected by all their successive forms of government,—his ordination, charge, authority, and duties being the same,) no other deacon exists.

J. P. W.

The Influence of Company:

A SERMON.

Prov. xiii, 20.—*He that walketh with wise men shall be wise: but a companion of fools shall be destroyed.*

THE words *wise* and *fool* are used, in the book of Proverbs, as synonymous with *good* and *bad*, *righteous* and *wicked*; or in the language of the New Testament, with *believer* and *unbeliever*. The propriety of such terms when not applied to reproach the one nor flatter the other, but merely as descriptive of facts, is clearly evident. Whether we consider the happiness religion affords to its possessors in this life, or the reward it brings to them in another; it is equally true that the wicked are foolish, and the righteous are wise. If the man who, through mere indolence, will not enjoy the comforts of life which are within his reach, be justly called a fool, as he is in the language of the world; then he who will not exert himself to obtain the joys of the Spirit, is properly chargeable with much greater folly. If the man who wastes his property through mere inattention to business be foolish; so is he who wastes the precious moments of a probationary state—property which he will one day see to be infinitely valuable. If the man who neglects to provide subsistence for himself and family in this world be foolish; much more is folly to be attributed to him who does not provide for himself in the world to come. In short, if the man who squanders the time in which he has the opportunity of acquiring a splendid fortune be chargeable with folly; then surely he who sports away the moments in which he may secure the golden crown of immortal glory, is foolish indeed. On the other hand, if the man who is dili-

gent in business, secures his property by all lawful means, takes care of his worldly concerns in the best manner, and improves every moment in the acquisition of something valuable, be wise; then he who secures the favour of God and thus provides for his immortal part that happiness “which fadeth not away, eternal in the heavens,” is wise in the highest sense. “The fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.”

Those who are wise enough to provide durable riches for themselves, will endeavour to provide them for their companions. So also those who are foolish enough to neglect these riches, will make fools of others over whom they have any influence.

Every man's moral character, then, will be much the same as that of his intimate associates. This is a maxim which is contained in our text. To illustrate and apply it, therefore, will be the object of the following discourse.

First then, it is abundantly implied in the *Scriptures*. The Psalmist, after giving an account of the holy exercises of his heart, and the daily devotions in which he was engaged, declares that he is a companion of all them that fear God, and of them that keep his precepts. (Ps. cxix. 63.) Such company he chose because their conversation and habits were like his own, their affections were placed on the same objects, and their kind admonitions and counsels were incentives to a godly life. To say that he was a *companion* of all them that fear God, it would appear, was the same thing in his view, as to say that he feared God himself. “Whoso keepeth the law,” says Solomon, “is a wise son: but a companion of riotous men shameth his father.” Here the inspired writer takes it for granted, that “a companion of riotous men” will himself be of the same character; for he uses the term as opposite to the keeping of the law. In our text also, he asserts, “He that walketh with wise men,” that is, he that is

their companion, "shall be wise: but a companion of fools shall be destroyed." Now it is obvious that no man will be punished for the faults of his neighbour. It is only because the companion of fools is himself a fool, and must therefore partake of the destiny to which that character is appointed, that Solomon says he shall be destroyed.

Not only is it the voice of Scripture that every man's moral character is much the same as that of his intimate associates, but *all the principles of human nature with which we are acquainted speak to the same point.*

Man is very much a creature of imitation. However he may disclaim it in moments of pride and independence, it is still true that he imitates continually those whom he loves, or for whose company he has an attachment. The man of roughness becomes polished by continual intercourse with polished society. The man of refinement becomes coarse and indelicate by a familiarity with persons of that description. Let a man of piety permit himself freely to associate with a person of thoughtlessness and gaiety, and one or the other will change his character; will catch the spirit of his companion. Either the latter will become thoughtful and tender on the subject of religion, or the former will find the ardour of his piety abate, and the temper of the world get the ascendancy.

This principle of imitation which thus assimilates people who associate together, begins with our infancy, and is never entirely eradicated in after life. The child so soon as he notices the objects about him, looks to the people with whom he is most familiar for examples. He learns to talk by imitation; he learns to read by imitation; and when he arrives at mature years, he learns the practices of the world by imitation. If his parents, or those with whom he is early conversant are respecters of religion, so is the child a respecter of religion; if they scoff at holy things, so does he; and if they are votaries of pleas-

ure, so is he. The companions whom he first chooses give another stamp to the character of his feelings and habits. He will not do what displeases his associates, because they would banish him from their society. He becomes therefore one with them in affections and pursuits.

On the supposition that this principle of imitation exists, proceed all the customs of life. To acquire the manners of polished society, your children are placed among polished people, that they may observe their actions and imitate them. To become merchants, they are placed in counting houses not only to learn their business, but that by continual intercourse with mercantile men, they may catch their spirit and acquire their habits.

That this principle of imitation exists is, moreover, evident from the similarity of manners and feelings which prevails in particular districts of country, and even in different circles of the same district. Now this similarity cannot always, nor indeed generally, proceed from the local situation of the people, but from their intercourse with each other by which they become identified in their tastes, their prejudices and their pursuits.

There is a principle of sympathy also, which operates to produce a similarity of character among those who associate together. We naturally mingle in the joys and sorrows of our companions, and feel as they do respecting the causes from which they flow. Thus we do until our feelings are touched by the same things, the same motives excite us to action, and the same character is ours. A man, for instance, has entered on an important enterprise concerning the issue of which he is very anxious. That man is your particular friend, who is perpetually expressing in your presence his hopes and fears. Now you cannot but enter deeply into his feelings; and when the joyful news of his success arrives, you rejoice with him. So also in things of a moral nature. If your intimate friend

is in the habit of rejoicing at the spread of irreligion or the downfall of piety in particular cases, you will insensibly catch his spirit, and feel as he does. The principle of sympathy, like all others, which God has implanted in us for our comfort and preservation, may be perverted to the worst of purposes.

That every man's moral character is much the same as that of his intimate associates, appears, moreover, from the testimony of *facts*.

Show me the man who is profane in his conversation, or a despiser of religion; and I will show you a companion of swearers or of infidels. It is invariably the case. You never saw a modest amiable man who did not choose men like himself for his companions. Nor did you ever behold a hater of religion who did not associate with similar men. Their company is the place where he finds encouragement in his wicked ways, where is lighted up the flame of enmity to virtue, and where that flame is continually fanned. Who were the men that Absalom chose for his companions? Not the pious adherents to his father's government; but men like himself, who wished to undermine the foundations of the public peace, and wrest the sceptre from the hands of its rightful possessor. With whom did the people that opposed Christ when he was upon earth, consort? The Priests and Levites, the Scribes and Pharisees were their chosen companions, because such were congenial souls. Judas, when he turned traitor, durst no more appear among the disciples of Christ. Paul, before his conversion, associated with the enemies of Jesus, and took counsel with them respecting the object which was dear to all their hearts, the destruction of the Church; but when his character changed, his companions were changed also.

From profane history, too, innumerable examples might be selected. Who were the associates of Voltaire? Infidels like himself. In whom did Robespierre meet with suitable com-

panions? In men whose consciences, like his, were "seared with a hot iron" and whose characters, therefore, were blackened with the foulest crimes. Yonder gamester,—did he go to the gaming table alone, or in the company of the virtuous? That sabbath-breaker,—In whose company is he when he walks the fields or rides for pleasure, instead of appearing, as his duty demands, in the house of God? The man who spends his time in idleness, instead of attending to his proper business,—does not he delight in the company of men like himself? Who are the men with whom yonder despiser of religion continually associates? Not the blameless disciples of the Son of God, whose conduct would be a perpetual reproof to his wicked practices; but men like himself who are ready to go all lengths in iniquity to gratify a sinful heart. Who are the men that yonder humble worshipper of God chooses for his companions? Not the scoffer, the sabbath-breaker, the profane; but those who pursue the same things that he does, and whose souls are of a kindred mould with his. Hear him speak the language of his heart, when he talks of Jerusalem, the city of his God. "For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be within thee." His companions then, are such as, like him, take an interest in the welfare of Zion. There all his friends dwell; and for their sakes as well as his own, he wishes her prosperity.

That every man's moral character is much the same as that of his associates, appears then from scripture, from the principles of human nature, and from facts. In deducing practical instruction from this important truth, I would observe,

1st, That we are here furnished with a *criterion by which to distinguish characters*.

There is no better rule to find out what a man is, in a moral point of view, than to inquire who the men are with whom he continually of choice associates. It has

therefore passed into a common proverb, "That a man is known by the company he keeps." Does any reader of this, then, take to his intimate friendship disturbers of the peace of society by their midnight carousals? That man is to be suspected of similar practices himself. Does any one habitually consort with the profane, the lascivious, the idle? He is to be set down as no better than they. Does any one, of choice, daily associate with the man whose darling subject is the disparagement of religious people or the cause which they profess to love? Write him down as an advocate of impiety. Does any one choose for his companions, "fools" who "make a mock at sin," and who trifle at every religious consideration? He is one of their number. On the other hand, is any one generally found in the company of the pious? Either he is pious himself, or he is "not far from the kingdom of God."

2. *We see by our subject the good influence of virtuous company.*

It is not only the language of our text, but, as we have seen, of experience, "He that walketh with wise men shall be wise." The company of religious people tends to create and preserve those reverential impressions of eternal things which are absolutely necessary to our becoming christians, or continuing such. He that from childhood, has been accustomed to look on religion and its concerns as matters of serious moment, is ordinarily more susceptible of salutary impressions of divine truth than others. Nay, the company of the pious often brings those, who have been taught to disregard religion, to the knowledge of the truth, and to the hopes of salvation. So far as religion influences its possessor, it makes him benevolent. He will therefore do all the good which lies in his power to his companions. The religion of the gospel is of a diffusive nature. It is not contented to reside in one breast; but sheds abroad its blessed influence. It

spreads around it a healthful atmosphere which nourishes all that come within its reach, and diffuses life and vigor and joy to them in abundance. It is the tree of life from whose wholesome branches proceed leaves for the healing of the nations. Can such a principle then exist in christians, and not prove beneficial to their intimate associates?

In the company of the pious too will be found those real friends who will not forsake us in the hour of adversity. Their principle is that "it is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting;" and they generally act accordingly. How often does the kind hand of christian friendship wipe away the tears of wo, and rob the destroyer of half his sting! How often is the healing balm administered to the wounded spirit, and the smile of heaven made to animate the countenance! Ye that have drunk the cup of sorrow, know the value of the friendship which is regulated by religion. Ye that choose your companions among the servants of God, feel the worth of their society. You know that in adversity as well as in prosperity they are constant. Their councils direct you in the wayward path of life, and their prayers ascend to the throne of divine grace in your behalf, and bring down the selectest of heaven's blessings upon you. And when the bed of death shall be spread for you and no earthly hand can help, their tender souls will be poured out before their heavenly Father, that he may receive you into the mansions of glory. Such is the benign influence of virtuous companions. But

3. *We learn from our subject another lesson,—the influence and danger of evil company, especially to the young.*

As we are naturally prone to catch the spirit of our associates, we are much more so when that spirit acts in conjunction with the wicked propensities of our own hearts. It is quaintly observed by the excellent

Richard Baxter, "that stones want no additional weight to keep them to the earth." As we are prone to evil, all the influence which company can afford, should be against it. Man is a social being; and as such, must have some society. As the company of the good sheds an influence whose tendency is to make us good also; so that of the bad awakens all the dormant energies of wickedness which the heart possesses, and calls them into action. Unlike the pious too, their friendship is not genuine. While the sky is clear, they are with us; but when the clouds thicken, they stand aloof; and when the storm breaks out, they retire, and leave us alone to suffer its desolation. What is such friendship worth? It has no substance. It is the mere shadow that moves along the wall. We attempt to grasp it; and it eludes us: the sun retires; and it is gone.

Even in its best circumstances, the intimate companionship of wicked men is a real calamity. It speaks but to blast, spreads devastation among all within its reach, and kindles up the fire of divine wrath which will burn forever. That unhappy youth began his career in the paths of decency and sobriety, and seemed to all a fair candidate for the kingdom of heaven. He was lovely in his behavior, generous and noble in his heart, and his company was sought by the wise and good. The smile of contentment sat upon his countenance, and the joy of spring beamed in his eye. In an evil hour he met with one of his own age whose manners were not destitute of many attractions; but whose heart was deeply rooted in the ways of sin. For the time, his conversation was lively and interesting, and mingled with no black spots to warn the devoted victim of his danger. The acquaintance is now formed, and another interview is soon had. The youth goes with his new companion to his accustomed places of resort, and finds them to be haunts of dissipation. His con-

science remonstrates, but he deems it too late, for this time, to withdraw. He returns to his retirement, and perhaps thinks on his evil way and mourns, and resolves to visit it no more. Not many days after, he receives another solicitation, but he remembers his former remorse, and refuses to comply. Importunity however prevails on him, and he goes with a failing heart. By the repetition of such scenes, he becomes at length divested of his salutary fears, and concludes that he is only indulging in the innocent pleasure which is proper for youth.

The first profane oath which he heard startled his tender conscience, and he felt that the wrath of God awaits all who thus trifle with their Maker. That oath is repeated until it passes by unnoticed. The breath of profaneness has lost its horror to his senses. At length he begins to question with himself whether such things be not a mark of superior courage and manliness of feeling. At first he rejected the idea with amazement; but by the suggestions of the great adversary and of his own heart, he again resumed it. He became more and more familiar with scenes of guilt till at length he ventured to drop a profane oath himself; and as he perceived no immediate evil resulting from it, he ventured to repeat that sin with less emotion than before. His companions by their example, if not by their advice, encouraged him to proceed in his career of wickedness, till he indulged in profaneness without remorse.

When he first heard religion and its concerns treated with levity, he noticed the awful profanation with abhorrence; and perhaps formed some faint resolutions to forsake the company where such things were heard. But the example of his associates and the tendency of his own heart to catch their spirit, hardened his conscience, and now that monitor within, which was once faithful, leaves him in the quiet possession of his iniquities. She has now only

fallen asleep, however, to awake beyond the grave, in the most dreadful agonies of despair.

This youth, then, who once appeared so pleasant to the eyes of piety, so fair a candidate for heaven, is now sunk in the depths of vice, and but little hope can remain of his being ever reclaimed to the paths of peace. Ah ! how unlike to that first happy state !

O Ye, who have thus been seduced from the society of the good, look from the borders of that pit into which you are just plunging, back to the gates of life. Say, are you willing to forego the pleasures of eternal glory for those sordid enjoyments which only end in disappointment and are followed, in your moments of reflection, by many a pang ? Say, are you willing to take up your abode in the dungeon of despair, when you might walk beneath the light which beams from the throne of God ? Say, is not the company with whom you associate, such as, if there is a hell, will lead you thither, and overwhelm you in that sea of trouble from which there is no deliverance ? By the influence of your companions, when the voice of conscience disturbs you, it is soon fled. You resort to your pleasures and drown the clamours within your breasts in noisy mirth. You fall asleep in your sin, and dream of happiness here, but put off the considerations of hereafter. It is an easy matter, with such consciences as you possess, to imagine that the wrath of God, because it is delayed, will never arrive. While surrounded by your companions, you can paint before your imaginations the delights of sin, and bury in a momentary oblivion the anguish which it must eventually afford. You can laugh at the salutary fears of piety, and commit those deeds of darkness to which your wicked hearts may prompt. And all this may serve as an opiate to lull you to repose. But,

——Say, dreamers of gay dreams ;
How will you weather an eternal night
Where such expedients fail ?

Of such however, as we have now addressed, there is little hope. Divine grace has power to reclaim them, but it need not be expected, except in here and there a solitary instance, for the sake of pious friends. Many undoubtedly are *given over* to work iniquity with greediness, and to reap its dreadful reward. It is to you who are yet free from the contamination of evil companions, that our hopes extend. Flee then the company of the wicked. "Their very touch is pollution, and their embrace is death." "Evil communications," says an inspired writer, "corrupt good manners." Seek ye, then, the company of such as fear the God of Heaven. If you have any regard to the interests of this world—if you have any regard to a "good name," which the Bible has pronounced to be "better than precious ointment ;" and above all—if you have any regard to the interests of the world to come, to the joys or sorrows of immortality,—flee the company of those who would introduce you into sin. Be not deceived with outward appearances. How fair and promising soever the show of friendship which a vicious man can make, may be ; he is only a friend clothed in the habiliments of an angel. He is only the serpent which promised with fair words, and drew his victim headlong into ruin. When an opportunity occurs, he will draw you away from all that is lovely in life, from all that can create peace in death and happiness beyond the grave. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful."

For the Christian Spectator.

THE subject of human ability to perform all the requirements of God, has been ably discussed by many writers in an abstract form. Considered merely as an intellectual

inquiry, it is attended with no difficulties; but in its practical application to the heart, difficulties arise which to the subjects of them often seem insurmountable, and influence the conduct and feelings more than the proof arising from an intellectual view of the question. The following letter was addressed to a person who in a state of great mental distress felt these difficulties in their full force, and as it proved the means of enlightening the mind of one in the knowledge of the truth, it is made public with the hope that it may assist others in similar circumstances, and throw light on a subject which to the feelings and intellect of depraved men has always been considered difficult and obscure :—

My dear Child,

I will immediately commence with the subject of your last letter. You will admit that the evidence of man's ability to obey God is, in itself considered, complete; that is, when the argument is stated, (were there no reasons from other considerations to doubt its correctness,) you would admit it to be conclusive.

God is just and good. To command impossibilities would be unjust; but he does command *love*; therefore it is not an impossibility. What have you to break the force of this argument? "A *consciousness* of inability," you will say. Suppose it to be so, how does the case then stand? The connexion between premises and conclusion, may in some cases be so obvious as that the perception of it shall as really be a matter of consciousness, as the consciousness of natural inability. And I cannot but believe that you *see* the conclusiveness of the argument in favour of ability, as plainly as you see or feel your inability. If you choose to make a distinction between intellectual perception and consciousness, it will not alter the case, since intellectual perception of truth in given circumstances, may constitute as high evidence of the *truth* perceived

as consciousness does of a *fact* perceived. You have then what amounts to two consciousnesses in relation to a matter of fact in direct opposition. You perceive in looking at evidence a proposition proved; and regarding your consciousness, you see it disproved. To which perception will you yield your assent? If you say that the intellectual perception of agreement between premises and a conclusion may be deceptive, I answer by saying again, the connexion may be so plain that it cannot be deceptive without destroying the foundation of moral certainty.

But it is time to enquire whether your inability is a matter of direct consciousness, or is not rather a conclusion drawn from premises precisely as in the other case. You make attempts to exercise love to God, in such circumstances and with such earnestness as convinces you that were it physically possible you should have succeeded. From reiterated unavailing efforts you conclude that the ability to love does not exist. I may then alter the statement a little, and say that you have proof, which you see to be correct, of the truth and falsehood of the same proposition. You see proof that you can, and that you cannot love God. To which of these propositions will you yield your assent? To neither you may say so long as the evidence of each perception is exactly balanced. But from the fact that your perceptions are contradictory you learn that what you call consciousness is not infallible on one side nor the other; your consciousness has deceived you. On which side are you misled, then, by a guide deemed infallible. Can you doubt which is the fallacious perception, that which coincides with the testimony of God, or that which contradicts it? that which maintains or that which denies the rectitude of his ways? that which upholds or that which overturns his moral government?

Do you demand how you shall es-

cape deception, if your plainest perception of truth may be deceptive? I should not well know how to answer the question if I thought the fact were really so. But I have stated your case with respect to inability much above what I suppose to be its merits. Let us examine a little the consciousness which is to annul all possible evidence, and defy every thing short of omnipotence. You say "you are as conscious of your inability to love God as you are of your inability to remove mountains; you feel as certain of the nonexistence of ability to love, as you do of the existence of any faculty of mind." These strong expressions prove your sincerity, but do they prove the existence of physical inability? Physical ability to love God must include all the faculties which are necessary to the exercise of that affection. To be conscious that you have not the requisite faculties, you must know what they are, and perceive the absence of one or more, or the incompetence of all combined, to produce the result demanded. You must *perceive* their deficiency, to be *conscious* of it. If you could do this you would be conscious of natural inability, but instead of perceiving directly any such physical defect, you perceive rather the existence of all the powers and faculties, which can be conceived as requisite, or which have ever been known to be possessed and exercised by those who actually obey God; so that instead of being conscious of physical inability, you are conscious of the existence of all the powers which can be considered as requisite, or have ever been known to exist in those who have actually exercised love.

But you will say, "If I do not know my inability by direct inspection, I learn it with absolute certainty another way. I learn by ineffectual efforts that I have not strength to remove mountains, and I learn with equal certainty the same way, my inability to love God. I have exerted to the uttermost all the powers I

possess, and am as certain that I cannot love as that I cannot remove mountains." But are you certain that you *have* done all that is possible in your attempts to love God? Examine this question prayerfully in his presence, and with your hand upon your heart. That you have not always done all you could do, is certain; but have you in fact *ever* put all your mind and soul and strength into an effort to love God? Remember that the testimony of God is that you *have not*, and that you have refused to do it; that you are the accused party, judging in your own case, with 'a heart deceitful above all things and desperately wicked,' and that multitudes who have spoken and acted as you do, have discovered their mistake.

If you have not put forth all your soul and mind and strength, then you are not conscious of inability; if you have once or twice, or for an hour, or a day, or a week, or a month, you are not certain of physical inability, for the effect which did not follow a temporary effort, might have followed a more protracted exertion. Can you claim any such entire and protracted exertion of all your powers? If not, where is your experimental knowledge of inability? Let us now come a little nearer, and analyze your supposed experimental evidence of inability. What have you done? Of what are you conscious? You are conscious of a great desire to love God, of making great exertions to that end, and of utter failure. Now if you cannot see that the failure cannot arise from any cause but natural inability, your experience would be proof of such inability. But you know that voluntary agency may render a course of conduct certain and unchangeable, as really as physical necessity. Jesus Christ is voluntarily unchangeable, and so are bad angels, and so, as God has decided, are sinful men. But you are 'conscious of actual desire and exertion to turn to God, so that though it were possible that volition should

ness as a front of rebellion against God. You are deceived by your heart, or by your analysis of your own experience. This is very possible, but it is not possible for God to lie, or be unjust. Oh my child, he is good and just, or you and I had never had a Saviour, and had now been

weeping and wailing without hope. I desire you to write me immediately, and may God soon grant to your darkened eyes, light, and to your desolate heart, joy and peace in believing.

Your affectionate father,

D. D.

Miscellaneous.

For the Christian Spectator.

The Reign of David.—No. I.

DAVID with his little band was encamped at Ziklag, when he received from a young Amalekite the news of the battle of Jezrael, in which Saul and his three sons had fallen. Having avenged the death of the king upon the supposed regicide, he composed a beautiful Elegy on the fallen monarch and his son. This he directed his countrymen to learn, that the valour and loveliness of Saul and Jonathan might never be forgotten. Here he enquired of the Lord (probably by Urim and Thummim, as Abiathar the Priest was then with him) whether he should go to one of the cities of Judah. Having received an answer, he removed his encampment to Hebron. At this place the men of Judah assembled, and acknowledged him as their sovereign. Here he received the ensigns of royalty, which were, 1st. anointing with the holy oil. This was probably performed by Abiathar, who alone remained after the slaughter of the Priests of Nob.*

* David as well as Saul had been privately anointed by Samuel before they were invested with the badge of royalty. This was emblematical of their being selected either for the service of God, or for the kingdom. As this was done in private, it was still necessary that a public coronation should take place in sight of all Israel, that every pretender to the crown might thus be excluded. Absalom was thus publicly anointed and acknowledged by the Israelites as their sovereign. 2 Sam. xix. 10.

2d. A crown was placed upon his brow. This I suppose to have been the crown of Saul, which David had received from the young Amalekite. 3d. The sceptre which was a badge of royalty, may have been added. The cry of "Long live the King" was undoubtedly shouted by the tribe of Judah, which in its loyalty to their sovereign was never equalled by the other tribes.

David held his court at Hebron seven years and six months. On the murder of Ishbosheth by the sons of Rimmon, he put the regicides to death, probably to inspire his people with reverence for royalty, and to extend his popularity. Soon after this event, the eleven tribes assembled, and with that of Judah anointed him king over all Israel. He then entered into a covenant with them, in which he bound himself and them, by conditions mutually agreed upon. This league was what may be termed the *Constitution of the Hebrew nation* during his reign. Of the extent of his power we are not directly informed, as the articles of this covenant are not mentioned, but from his life we are enabled to form some idea of the government at this period.

I. *What was the Constitution of the Hebrews during the reign of David?*

In examining this subject, it will be necessary to make a few remarks on the Hebrew government before the time of the kings.

God was acknowledged by the patriarchs as the only proper object of

worship. From him they received directions as to the course they were to pursue in life. Still they were so few in number, that the *Theocracy* cannot be supposed to have then existed. While they were in Egypt, he seldom appeared to them, and it was not until their descendants left the *land of bondage* that he claimed the right of governing them as a nation. This right was grounded, as he says by his Angel when reproving the Israelites at Bochim, on the great deliverance he wrought for them in bringing them from Egypt to the land of promise and thus founding their kingdom, and also on the fact that God bound himself by promises, that if they would worship and obey him, he would reward them. They publicly acknowledged him as their sovereign in two instances, *first* in the days of Moses, Ex. xix. 8, and *again* in the time of Joshua, Joshua xxiv. 16—21. This was what constituted the *Theocracy*, which lasted until the time of Samuel, when the Israelites wishing to have a king to lead them on to battle, broke from their allegiance to Deity. God permitted them to choose by lot a king who should rule over them, but reserved to himself the privilege of directing the monarch, promising his blessing if he obeyed him, and threatening him with punishment if he should disobey his commands. He did not here abdicate his right to govern them; it was only his nominal right which he resigned, as appears from the fact that he took the sceptre from the family of Saul, in consequence of his disobedience, and gave it unto the man whom he had chosen. David's right to the throne was real, but to the government it was only nominal. He was merely the vicegerent of Deity, receiving directions from him, and executing all his commands. This subjection David continually acknowledged, not only by consulting the Oracle of God whenever he was doubtful of the issue of any enterprise, but also in his prayers and in his life. The will of Deity was his only rule.

In minor points of view however, the king was sole ruler. The power with which he was invested related to the ordinary concerns of government, which he performed without consulting the will of Heaven. It was only on great occasions, those which were *national*, and in a great measure involving the interests of his people, that he looked to the Most High for direction.

That the extent of David's power was great cannot be questioned. The covenant which he made with the Israelites gave him many rights which he exercised during his reign. He sometimes acted with rigour, but from the native amiableness of his heart, he usually felt that it was better that "five guilty persons should escape, than that one innocent man should suffer." What these rights were, we can only learn from the history of his reign. Some of them I will now examine.

First, His Rights as a Judge.

Moses while in the wilderness found it impossible to decide upon the numerous questions presented to him by the people. With the advice of Jethro, priest of Midian, he appointed a number of subordinate judges, who decided upon all questions of minor importance. Whether they existed in the age of David we are not informed. They in a great measure ceased, during the stormy period which intervened between the death of Joshua and the age of Samuel, a period in which idolatry and wickedness were so triumphant, that very little regard was paid to the laws of Moses. That they ceased to exist is still more probable from the fact, that it is so often mentioned, that every one did what was right in his own eyes, and from no mention being made of them. They may have been restored towards the conclusion of this period, as Eli says to his sons, if a man sin against another, the judge shall judge him; but as Elohim is here used, I presume he referred to the Judge of the nation, rather than to the inferior judges. No mention

perpetuate your disobedience, it is certain to your own inspection that it is not volition which does it. It must be therefore physical inability.' It is time now that you open your eyes upon a phenomenon of the human heart which has evidently escaped your observation. It is the existence in the heart of what some have called *disposition*, but what may more properly be termed *Generic Volition*. It is a stated habitual all-powerful *choice*; often indeed opposed by specific volitions, regrets, resolutions, and efforts of a subordinate character. In other words, a man may, all things considered, choose to hold on in a certain course which he fears to tread, and regrets to tread, and strives to turn from, but with a resolution and choice inferior to the generic volition which bears him on. A husband may see that his criminal attachment to another is conducting him to ruin, may regret he ever saw the enchantress, resolve he will never see her again, and weep and pray to be delivered from the besetting sin, and yet this generic affection may be supreme compared with every volition to the contrary, and prostrate every resolution, and render nugatory every effort. I select this example to illustrate the fact, that choice may be opposed to choice, and affection to affection in the heart, and that the generic affection may maintain its empire in the midst of the petulant opposition and regret and wailings of subordinate volitions; while these are so importunate as to seem to be the whole heart, and would seem to prove that there must be a physical inability of resisting the criminal attachment, when in fact it is not inability, but a more powerful silent settled choice another way.

This contradiction of the affections arises from the fact that an object, all things considered, may be preferred, when on many accounts the preference is regretted. The failure to love, then, which you ascribe to physical inability, may arise from another, and a voluntary cause. What the

Scriptures denominate, your 'heart,' is none other than a settled aversion to God, and preference of the world to him, and you may voluntarily hold out in this preference and aversion, in the midst of such convictions of its folly, such fears of its issue, and such regrets and efforts to the contrary as that these little feeble specific opposing volitions, should seem to be your whole heart and all your might, when in fact the strength of your heart is opposed to these volitions, and is the only cause of their futility. Do you ask, 'If this generic volition is so powerful, why should I be so unconscious of its existence?' This calls you to regard another fact in the history of the mind. Nothing is more common than the unperceived influence of a generic volition. Nothing is more common than for men to be actuated by motives which they do not suspect, and by evil passions and affections, of whose existence they are unconscious. And what is confessedly true in the intercourse of life, the scriptures declare to be true in our intercourse with God. While 'the heart is desperately wicked,' it is also so deceitful, that it may well be said, 'who can know it?' The *invisibility* of a generic volition is *no* evidence of its nonexistence. But is it invisible? What is the ground of your just apprehension that if you do not soon find the comforts of religion, you shall return to folly and the enjoyment of the world? Is there not a repellency in God which renders approach irksome? and a superior attachment to the world, poor as it is, which renders a return to it certain? And should his mercy delay, and you return to forgetfulness of God and your own soul, will you not be able to perceive that your own choice leads the way?

The result, then, of this already too protracted investigation is,

1. Your perception that God commands love, and that therefore, God being just, it is possible,—is as clear and certain evidence of the truth as

your consciousness of inability can be of that fact.

2. Your inability is not ascertained by evidence, but by consciousness; not by seeing a physical defect or incapacity, but it is an inference drawn from unsuccessful effort, and this inference of inability is, to say the least, not more clear and certain than the evidence of your ability from God's justice, and his requirements.

3. The evidence on *one* side *must be false*, and that being the case your 'iron brow' of pleaded consciousness must give way to the testimony of God. 'Let God be true, but every man a liar.'

4. The silent unobserved prevalence of a generic disposition or volition, so opposed by subordinate volitions as that these shall seem to be all the heart, and resistance seem to be impossible, is a matter of common experience, and according to the bible is the actual state of the case in respect to our duty to God. And the fact that we are not conscious of this generic volition furnishes no evidence against the testimony of the bible that it does exist, it being a common thing for master passions to prevail in the heart unseen and unrecognized. Such is the result, my child, of the best attention I have been able to give this subject; and it convinces me, and I pray God it may convince you, that you set up against divine testimony, a consciousness of inability which does not exist, as an evidence of a fact which has no being, and is contradicted alike by the bible and what you see in your own heart.

Do you ask to what conclusion I would bring you? I answer,

1. I do not expect by evidence to make you *feel* as if you are able to love God. The feeling is and will be, in all cases, as if it were impossible.

2. Nor do I wish to create in you the expectation that without sovereign grace you ever will actually exercise the ability you possess; I rather desire that the fact of your dependence

on God should be felt, if possible, still more deeply than you feel it. But,

3. I do desire that upon divine testimony, in opposition to any presumptuous reliance on your own supposed consciousness, you *believe* in the actual fact of *ability*, on the foundation of equity in the Divine requisition, and such ability as clothes with justice all the requirements and penalties of God, and with mercy all divine interpositions both of the Mediator to atone and of the Spirit to sanctify. This I desire you to do, as I do myself; for though I believe the course of reasoning correct which I have adopted and pursued, in this letter, my faith stands, not in my speculations, not in my capacity to see and explain *how* it can be that I am so able and so obstinate; but on the fact that it is so because God cannot err, cannot lie, and by word and deed has declared it to be so, and that in fact he administers his eternal government on the assumption of ability commensurate with requisition. Were I to depart from my implicit confidence in God, I could find as many difficulties, and ask as many unanswerable questions as you do, but I know that what God says is true, and that what he does is right; and here I rest my faith, and desire you to rest yours. And if in this letter I have ventured into deep waters, it is not because I prefer to wade in them, but to rescue from drowning my own dear child, who is in vain seeking to lay among the billows the foundations of her hope and confidence towards God.

You have the prayers of all your friends here, but you must not let this alleviate the pressure of personal obligation by relying on them. It is your duty and reasonable service to give your heart to God, to come as a lost sinner to be saved by Christ. I wish you to feel, as you do, that your eternal destiny turns upon a few weeks,—perhaps days,—or even hours. I do not ask you to *feel* able. But I am authorized to entreat you not to set up a fallacious conscious-

ness as a front of rebellion against God. You are deceived by your heart, or by your analysis of your own experience. This is very possible, but it is not possible for God to lie, or be unjust. Oh my child, he is good and just, or you and I had never had a Saviour, and had now been

weeping and wailing without hope. I desire you to write me immediately, and may God soon grant to your darkened eyes, light, and to your desolate heart, joy and peace in believing.

Your affectionate father,
D. D.

Miscellaneous.

For the Christian Spectator.

The Reign of David.—No. I.

DAVID with his little band was encamped at Ziklag, when he received from a young Amalekite the news of the battle of Jezrael, in which Saul and his three sons had fallen. Having avenged the death of the king upon the supposed regicide, he composed a beautiful Elegy on the fallen monarch and his son. This he directed his countrymen to learn, that the valour and loveliness of Saul and Jonathan might never be forgotten. Here he enquired of the Lord (probably by Urim and Thummim, as Abiathar the Priest was then with him) whether he should go to one of the cities of Judah. Having received an answer, he removed his encampment to Hebron. At this place the men of Judah assembled, and acknowledged him as their sovereign. Here he received the ensigns of royalty, which were, 1st. anointing with the holy oil. This was probably performed by Abiathar, who alone remained after the slaughter of the Priests of Nob.*

* David as well as Saul had been privately anointed by Samuel before they were invested with the badge of royalty. This was emblematical of their being selected either for the service of God, or for the kingdom. As this was done in private, it was still necessary that a public coronation should take place in sight of all Israel, that every pretender to the crown might thus be excluded. Absalom was thus publicly anointed and acknowledged by the Israelites as their sovereign. 2 Sam. xix. 10.

2d. A crown was placed upon his brow. This I suppose to have been the crown of Saul, which David had received from the young Amalekite. 3d. The sceptre which was a badge of royalty, may have been added. The cry of "Long live the King" was undoubtedly shouted by the tribe of Judah, which in its loyalty to their sovereign was never equalled by the other tribes.

David held his court at Hebron seven years and six months. On the murder of Ishbosheth by the sons of Rimmon, he put the regicides to death, probably to inspire his people with reverence for royalty, and to extend his popularity. Soon after this event, the eleven tribes assembled, and with that of Judah anointed him king over all Israel. He then entered into a covenant with them, in which he bound himself and them, by conditions mutually agreed upon. This league was what may be termed the *Constitution of the Hebrew nation* during his reign. Of the extent of his power we are not directly informed, as the articles of this covenant are not mentioned, but from his life we are enabled to form some idea of the government at this period.

I. *What was the Constitution of the Hebrews during the reign of David?*

In examining this subject, it will be necessary to make a few remarks on the Hebrew government before the time of the kings.

God was acknowledged by the patriarchs as the only proper object of

worship. From him they received directions as to the course they were to pursue in life. Still they were so few in number, that the *Theocracy* cannot be supposed to have then existed. While they were in Egypt, he seldom appeared to them, and it was not until their descendants left the *land of bondage* that he claimed the right of governing them as a nation. This right was grounded, as he says by his Angel when reproofing the Israelites at Bochim, on the great deliverance he wrought for them in bringing them from Egypt to the land of promise and thus founding their kingdom, and also on the fact that God bound himself by promises, that if they would worship and obey him, he would reward them. They publicly acknowledged him as their sovereign in two instances, *first* in the days of Moses, Ex. xix. 8, and *again* in the time of Joshua, Joshua xxiv. 16—21. This was what constituted the *Theocracy*, which lasted until the time of Samuel, when the Israelites wishing to have a king to lead them on to battle, broke from their allegiance to Deity. God permitted them to choose by lot a king who should rule over them, but reserved to himself the privilege of directing the monarch, promising his blessing if he obeyed him, and threatening him with punishment if he should disobey his commands. He did not here abdicate his right to govern them; it was only his nominal right which he resigned, as appears from the fact that he took the sceptre from the family of Saul, in consequence of his disobedience, and gave it unto the man whom he had chosen. David's right to the throne was real, but to the government it was only nominal. He was merely the vicegerent of Deity, receiving directions from him, and executing all his commands. This subjection David continually acknowledged, not only by consulting the Oracle of God whenever he was doubtful of the issue of any enterprise, but also in his prayers and in his life. The will of Deity was his only rule.

In minor points of view however, the king was sole ruler. The power with which he was invested related to the ordinary concerns of government, which he performed without consulting the will of Heaven. It was only on great occasions, those which were *national*, and in a great measure involving the interests of his people, that he looked to the Most High for direction.

That the extent of David's power was great cannot be questioned. The covenant which he made with the Israelites gave him many rights which he exercised during his reign. He sometimes acted with rigour, but from the native amiableness of his heart, he usually felt that it was better that "five guilty persons should escape, than that one innocent man should suffer." What these rights were, we can only learn from the history of his reign. Some of them I will now examine.

First, His Rights as a Judge.

Moses while in the wilderness found it impossible to decide upon the numerous questions presented to him by the people. With the advice of Jethro, priest of Midian, he appointed a number of subordinate judges, who decided upon all questions of minor importance. Whether they existed in the age of David we are not informed. They in a great measure ceased, during the stormy period which intervened between the death of Joshua and the age of Samuel, a period in which idolatry and wickedness were so triumphant, that very little regard was paid to the laws of Moses. That they ceased to exist is still more probable from the fact, that it is so often mentioned, that every one did what was right in his own eyes, and from no mention being made of them. They may have been restored towards the conclusion of this period, as Eli says to his sons, if a man sin against another, the judge shall judge him; but as Elohim is here used, I presume he referred to the Judge of the nation, rather than to the inferior judges. No mention

is made of them during the days of Saul and David, from which we should infer that they exerted little if any influence at that time. If they existed, they must have been unfit to dispense justice in a manner adapted to the wants of the nation, for David found it necessary to alter their judiciary. This he did by appointing *six thousand Levites* as judges and officers. 1 Chron. xxiii. 4. Whether the inferior judges existed or not, we find that David sat as supreme judge, and listened to those causes of importance which were above the cognizance of the lower bench, holding his court in the morning at the gate of the city. 2 Sam. xv. 2. The forms of trial were much shorter and more summary than ours, as we should infer first from the fact that Moses listened for some time to the complaints of two million five hundred thousand persons, and secondly from the rapidity with which David passed sentence on the criminals brought before him.

The complaints brought to David were various. Some of them were of great importance. That mentioned by Nathan in his parable, was limited in value, but as an instance of cruelty it needed an exemplary punishment, as a warning to the oppressor of the poor; while that presented by the wise woman of Tekoa involved the life of her son, and the extinction of a family in Israel. In these two instances, David departed from the law of Moses, which required that no person should be condemned, but by the mouth of two witnesses. This right may have been a part of the covenant mutually agreed upon between the king and his people; otherwise it exhibits a stretch of his prerogative as monarch of his people. That life and death were in his hand, is evident from the punishment he inflicted on the sons of Rimmon, while acting under the constitution of the kingdom of Judah, as well as afterwards under that of Israel, in directing Solomon not to let the hoary head of Joab go to the grave in peace.

The same power he evidently had a right to exercise over Shimei, on his return from the battle of Mahanaim, but wishing to gain popularity among those tribes which had just returned to their allegiance, he chose to exhibit clemency, though he afterwards gave proof of his power over the life of this subject, in directing Solomon to punish him with death for his disloyalty to him while in affliction. It was from fear of the sons of Zereuiah, because, as he expresses it, they were *too hard for him*, that David did not exercise this royal prerogative in punishing Joab immediately after he murdered Abner and Amasa. As Joab was an able General, and popular in the army, he may have dreaded the effect of such a punishment. That this right over the life of his subjects was absolute, will farther appear if we examine the treatment of the priests of Nob by Saul, who, on the information of his chief shepherd, an Edomite, ordered them with their wives and little ones to be massacred. In our Bibles we read eighty-five persons, but in the manuscript consulted by Josephus in writing his history, they amounted to three hundred and eighty five, vid. Josephus, B. 6. ch. 13. To this despotism the Israelites would never have submitted, had not the power of the crown extended over the lives of the subjects. Saul's determination to kill his son Jonathan for eating of the wild honey, is another instance of the extent of royal power, but these are sufficient to show that the monarchy was in some respects despotic.

Secondly, His Rights over the property and liberties of his subjects.

That the power of David was great here, and such as the Republicans of our happy country would not submit to with cheerfulness, is very evident to every reader of the books of Samuel. When Samuel describes to the nation assembled at Ramah the manner of the king, who should reign over them, he mentions the following as the prerogatives of royalty. 1. A conscription of the people for the ar-

my, and to labour in the royal fields. 2. That the monarch would take their daughters to be cooks, confectioners and bakers. 3. His right of seizing the best of their lands, and giving them to his favourites. 4. Tithing the produce of their lands for himself and his officers. 5. Taking their sons for artists to make instruments of war. 6. That he would take their male and female servants, and their strongest young men, and beasts of burden, to labour in his fields. 7. That they should become his servants. Such a prospect of oppression did not conquer their desire to see a king placed over them, and on these conditions they insisted upon having a monarch, and thus becoming like the nations around them.* The power of David over the property and persons of his subjects was probably as great as that of Saul, for he was a favourite of the nation, and they needed the strength of his arm to deliver them from the enemies who were then threatening Palestine. If so, he does not appear to have availed himself of all those rights, although he placed some of the Hebrews in his fields and vineyards, over his flocks, herds and camels, as appears from 1 Chron. xxvii. There was no necessity for his placing them in the most menial situations, as there were at that time a great number of Hittites, Jebusites, Gibeonites, &c. whom the children of Israel had suffered to continue among them. This number, as appears from 2 Chronicles, ii. 17, amounted to one hundred and fifty-three thousand six hundred, soon after the death of David, and by com-

* In 1 Samuel, x. 25, it is said that Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book, and placed it before the Lord. The expression, manner of the kingdom, has reference to the mode of government, including the rights of the king and his subjects. As these were agreed to by the people, the monarch would always claim the rights which were granted to him. As the book was deposited *before the Lord*, the rights of the king and the people as mutually agreed upon, could easily be known.

paring that passage with 1 Kings, ix. 20, 21, it will be seen that they were bondmen, and so numerous that Solomon did not exercise the right which he doubtless would have otherwise felt as his prerogative, of reducing some of the Israelites to slavery. In some respects Solomon probably went to the extent of his power, if not beyond it, for we find that after his death the Hebrews complained to Rehoboam of the severity of his father's administration, who not only refused to listen to their complaints, but threatened to impose still heavier burdens upon them. He in this manner violated the constitution, and consequently the Israelites felt as if they were freed from their allegiance. It was in consequence of this violation that the two tribes which adhered to him were forbidden to make war upon their brethren, in the message from God which Shemaiah carried to the king.

One right which David exercised was peculiar, and one which has rarely existed. I refer to his choosing a successor. The first born according to the Mosaic law was entitled to a double portion, Deut. xxi. 17. That this had been the custom from time immemorial is probable from the fact, that it was acknowledged by the Patriarchs. It is true that Jacob gave a double portion to Joseph, but it was because Reuben *went up to the couch of his father*. David however deviated from this rule, and directed that Solomon, his youngest son, should sit upon his throne. This privilege was probably a part of the constitution, as otherwise the Israelites would have acknowledged Adonijah's right of primogeniture, and supported him in it; but instead of that, Bathsheba says, 1 Kings, i. 20, *The eyes of all Israel are on thee, O! King, that thou shouldest tell them who shall sit on the throne of my Lord the King*.

From what has been said, it would seem as if the power of David was quite as great as that of most despots of modern times. There were however several checks to it, which re-

sulted from the peculiar situation of the kingdom in relation to God, and from the manner in which the nation was divided. These were, *first*, the existence of a prophet of God, who kept a watch over the conduct of the king. Whenever he unjustly oppressed his subjects, the prophet came with a message from God, threatening him with punishment unless he rendered a compensation for his injustice, and if the injury was irreparable, informing him of the punishment that awaited him. The message of Nathan to David, and that of Elijah to Ahab after the murder of Naboth, show not only the fidelity of the prophet, but the great check which they must have been to injustice, although under the influence of strong passion, the kings did not feel their influence at the time the crime was perpetrated.

The *second check* consisted in the form of their government, which was half republican as well as half despotic. I allude to the division into twelve tribes. Each tribe was almost an independent republic, and only united to the other tribes by the covenant which they had made with the king. All their officers were chosen from among themselves, and with the exception of the obligations imposed upon them by the covenant, they being children of the same ancestors, and having the same religion, they were free to act without consulting the other tribes. Accordingly we find in the time of the judges, individual tribes making war without advising with the other tribes, and also under the monarchy the two and one half tribes east of Jordan, made war on those nations situated between the mountains of Gilead and the Euphrates, and gained over them one of the greatest victories recorded in their national history. This occurred in the days of Saul, but without consulting the tribes west of that river. So little do they appear to have been influenced by the other tribes, that the author of the books

of Samuel, who describes those events which occurred in connexion with the king, does not even allude to it. It is incidentally mentioned in the 1st book of Chronicles, v. 21. Each tribe had a prince or leader, who was the monarch of the tribe. He kept a continual watch over the rights of his brethren, and whenever they were invaded, he formed a rallying point for those of the same community. It was this separate interest in favour of their tribe, that kept alive a constant spirit of resistance to every attempt to trample on their rights, and which operated as a powerful check to the ambition of the monarch. It was this spirit of resistance to oppression, which divided the kingdom under Rehoboam. It was this separate interest which induced the tribe of Judah to crown David, and after the death of Absalom to take measures to reinstate him on the throne, without consulting their brethren. David during his whole reign felt the influence of these leaders. This peculiar form in their government kept down for a long time the spirit of tyranny, which would naturally arise in the mind of one, who had extended his conquests as he did. He seems in the latter part of his reign to have been under its influence, and to have formed designs which were calculated to break down this check to royal power. But of this I shall speak in its proper place.

II. *The Extent of the Revenue of David.*

The income of the Hebrew kings was derived from a great variety of sources within the bounds of the empire. From these as well as from the plunder of the surrounding nations, David amassed a fortune, which for its amount has never been equalled by any monarch since Solomon. These sources are,

First. A 'Tithe of their fields, flocks and vineyards.' This tax they submitted to on the condition that Samuel should choose a king for them. Whether David added to his

revenue from this source, we are ignorant.

Secondly. By taking their fields and vineyards and olive grounds, and giving them to his servants, probably as a reward for their services. In this way the king was not under the necessity of making encroachments on his treasury for this object. The history of David has not informed us whether this was one of the sources of his income.

Thirdly. By receiving a tax from his subjects. What this was we know not, but that such a tax existed, is probable from the fact that Saul promised the person who should slay Goliath, that not only he but his family should be *free in Israel*. It is possible that this may refer to the tithe which they paid to the King, 1 Sam. viii. ; but I rather think it refers to some other tax, possibly to that which they had to pay when they came into the presence of the king.

In the *Fourth* place, from the income of his lands and flocks. Doeg was overseer of the flocks of Saul, which were pastured near the Dead Sea. David fed his herds in Sharon, and in the vallies. He had also camels, flocks and asses, feeding in his pastures, and in those of Arabia, 1 Chron. xxvii. The income from the royal flocks and herds was very great, if we may form an opinion from the wealth of some private men during his reign, and that of Saul, as Barzillai, Shobi, Machir and Nabal. In addition to these he had vineyards, olive grounds, sycamore trees, and land which was cultivated by the Canaanites who were in bondage.

Fifthly, from the plunder of foreign nations. David smote the Syrians, Moabites, Philistines, Amalekites, Edomites, the nations in alliance with the king of Zoboh, &c. &c. From these he took an immense amount of gold, *silver, brass,

* The crown of the king of Ammon weighed, it is said, a talent of gold. As a talent weighs 125 pounds, the cranium of

&c. and brought it to Jerusalem. These nations he not only subdued, but compelled them to pay tribute.

In the *Sixth* place, from presents. It was customary among the Jews to approach a person of distinction with a present. David probably received such from his subjects when he decided their litigations, and whenever they approached him on other occasions. Such presents were given to Saul at his coronation, and sent by Jesse to the King when David went to play before him on his harp.

Seventhly. Solomon received a duty from the Caravans of Merchants, 1 Kings x. 15. Through Palestine several of the nations which bordered the eastern boundary of the Holy land must necessarily pass in their direct route to Egypt. David undoubtedly availed himself of this source of wealth as his hand was heavy on the heathen nations around him. After he extended his dominions on the South to the Red Sea, the Moabites, Ammonites, Ishmaelites, Syrians, Midianites, &c. &c. must either pass directly through Palestine, or going East of the Red Sea, through Idumea. Here the troops which he had garrisoned throughout this extensive tract of country, could easily collect the duty of every caravan.

Notwithstanding all these sources of wealth, it is often doubted by learned men whether David ever amassed such immense treasures, as the author of Chronicles relates, xxii ch. 14 verse. David says to Solomon *I have collected one hundred thousand talents of gold, one million of talents of silver*, and brass and iron without weight. Calling the talent of gold (vid Jahn's Antiquities) £5475, and the talent of silver £342, (leaving out the odd shillings.) this

the Ammonitish monarch was not thick enough to carry such a weight. I suppose the talent of gold refers to the value rather than to the weight. Josephus says that "this crown had a sardonyx in the middle of it and that David wore this crown ever after on his head," Book 7 chap. 8.

sum would amount to 789 millions of pounds sterling. This is a greater sum than has been coined since the discovery of America. It will be observed here that I do not include the precious stones which must have made no small addition to the value. If no mistake has been made by the transcribers of this book, David exhibited a skill and a degree of economy in managing his finances, which the English government would do well to imitate, if they ever hope to liquidate their national debt. This sum it is to be remembered he collected for the Sanctuary. In addition to this his own resources must have been immense as we should infer from the amount, which he expended in his palace and other buildings, in adorning the city, in giving a splendour to his court, and in the numerous wars which he carried on, which were frequently at a great distance from his capital. The contributions of the people for the Sanctuary, exceeded thirty millions of pounds sterling, from which it is certain, that there was an immense amount of gold and silver circulating in Judea during the reign of David.

It appears at first sight improbable that so much wealth existed at that time in Judea and in the neighbouring countries which David subdued. It should however be remembered, that the fountains of wealth which were then overflowing are now exhausted—that the gold mines of Ophir and Sheba which David's fleets are supposed to have visited after he conquered Idumea, are now so entirely unknown that learned men cannot agree on what continent the former was situated. There were doubtless other mines from which the nations East of Palestine procured their great wealth and splendour, perhaps equal to those of Sheba and Ophir, but not mentioned by the Sacred Writers, as the Hebrews had little or no intercourse with them. Gold was known and highly valued soon after the deluge

and in the time of Abraham ornaments were made of it. In Egypt it appears to have existed in great abundance at an early period of her history. We are informed by Moses, that the Israelites when called upon to bring offerings to God, presented 29 talents and 730 shekels of gold and 100 talents and 1775 shekels of silver or more than 850,000 dollars, a sum greater than has been contributed in this country to send the gospel abroad during the last twenty years. The Israelites it is to be remembered would have given a much greater sum if their liberality had not been restrained. This was given by a people who had just emerged from Slavery, and had had no means of acquiring property, but by borrowing it of the Egyptians. As their liberality was restrained, they undoubtedly possessed a much larger sum than that which they contributed to adorn the Ark and Mercy seat. Now as the Israelites dwelt in Goshen, they had access to only a limited number of Egyptians besides their Overseers. If they procured such a sum from so small a number of the inhabitants of Egypt, the amount of gold and silver in that country, must have been immense. We know from sacred and profane history that the splendour of Ninevah, Babylon, and other capitals of the East, was much greater than of modern cities. David took from the King of Zobah and his allies, *Shields and other instruments of Gold*, from which it is probable, that the wealth of those countries was much greater than that of the nations of Europe.

It is only on the supposition that there was more wealth formerly than at present, that we can account for the immense resources of individuals. Haman the Agagite, offered Ahasuerus on condition of his permitting him to order the destruction of the Jews, *ten thousand talents of Gold* or three million four hundred and twenty thousand pounds sterling. It is true he bore the Jews a grudge for having in the reign of Saul des-

troyed the Amalekites from whom he was descended. But if he was induced by a desire of revenge to give a large sum, it must be allowed to have been more than any individual of the present day could dispense with who had recently been raised to eminence, and can only be accounted for by supposing that the amount of the precious metals was much greater formerly, than at present. It is only on this supposition that we can reconcile with truth the immense treasures brought by the Roman Emperors to Rome, when returning from victory; or the great wealth of individuals in that city one of whom Marcus Crassus,* was enabled to spread ten thousand tables, at which he feasted all the inhabitants of his native city, and then gave each of them corn enough to last them three months, without injuring his fortune. If the fact be admitted (as appears probable from the preceding remarks) that the amount of wealth was then much greater than at present we can easily believe that the sum which David collected for the Sanctuary is not over estimated.

III. *The Population of Palestine.*

Few subjects have perplexed learned men more than the Census of the Hebrews, when compared with the limited extent of their country. There were three censuses taken by Moses while in the wilderness, unless we suppose that taken in Numbers 2d. is the same with that mentioned in Exodus xxxviii, 26. which is probable from the fact that the numbers are precisely the same in each instance. What strengthens the supposition is that it was taken the year after the first. As no leader could wish to know the number of his people every year, we can suppose that it was taken during the parts of two years. According to the first nomenclature, the Israelites amounted to 603,550 *males over twenty years of age*; according to the last (Numbers 26th,) to 601,730. If

we multiply this number by three and one half for the number of women and children and those males who were exempted from service, we shall have 2,707,785, as the population of Israel excepting the tribe of Levi, at the time they entered Palestine. According to the common estimate, Palestine is not over 170 miles long and varying from 80 to 22 in breadth. If we call it 200 miles long by 100 in breadth, which will be making every allowance that those demand who place the mountains of Gilead farthest to the East, we shall have 20,000 square miles or 130 persons to a square mile. This is a much smaller population to a square mile, than in many of the countries of Europe at the present time. But those who object to the account of the Israelitish Census, would probably not allow this to be a fair estimate. I will therefore suppose it 170 miles in length and deducting Philistia and Phoenicia, which the original inhabitants still occupied, if we call its average breadth 60 miles, we shall have, 10,200 square miles. This supported a population of 2,707,000, or not far from 270 to a square mile. The question is often asked, how could Moses place his people in so small a tract of country, and does it not argue great want of foresight on the part of the Israelitish Leader. Such questions result from our having always looked at Palestine through the medium of Europe, and this country, and from not taking into view the peculiar situation of the Israelites, and the physical character of the country, which they conquered. That I may not do Moses injustice, I will state all the arguments which I have met with in support of the assertion, that Palestine contained such a population. For several of these I am indebted to Michaelis a writer, who though sometimes visionary, rarely introduces a subject connected with the East, without illuminating it.

1. Palestine is *spoken of throughout the Bible as remarkable for its*

*Vide Prideaux.

fertility, and although it now exhibits nothing of its former appearance, it is to be remembered that it is *under a curse*. This curse is *the existence of numerous hordes* of Arabs and others inhabitants of the Desert, who continually roam over its surface in search of prey. They not only do not cultivate the soil themselves, but they do not allow others to cultivate it. Like the Jews in the time of Gideon, they are every moment liable to be plundered. I see no reason to believe that the soil has undergone any transformation, for we find that all modern Travellers, speak of it as being very luxuriant when cultivated. We should also remember, that before it fell under the dominion of the Turks, it was a kind of common ground for the surrounding nations to plunder and lay waste. Not only do modern Travellers, but Abulfeda the great Arabic Geographer, as quoted by Michaelis, describes it as the most fertile part of Syria. Josephus speaking of the two Galilees, says that "its soil is universally rich and fruitful, so that it invites the most slothful to take pains in its cultivation by its fruitfulness. The cities lie here so very thick, and the very many villages there are here, are every where so full of people, by the richness of their soil, that the very least of them contains above 18,000 people," Book iii, chap. 3. and as quoted by Jahn, though I have not been able to discover it, "that there are 204 cities in Galilee, the largest containing 150,000 inhabitants, and the smallest 15,000. Galilee is 40 miles long by 30 in breadth, which supposing them to average only 15,000, is 250 to a square mile."

2. They did not, as we do in our extensive country, select merely the most fertile places and cultivate them but every part of the country glowed with beauty. Not only were their rocks, as Maundrell states, covered with soil, but their mountains were terraced, and when not too lofty, were under the highest cultivation. Mount Carmel was cultivated in this manner,

and its fertility and beauty are often favourite objects of comparison with the Hebrew poets. Every foot of ground yielded its yearly revenue, not to the wild beast to tread upon, but to support and nourish man.

3. *They used no wood for fuel, in comparison with the nations of Europe and with our own country.* Probably three fourths of this state, Connecticut, (which now supports a population of 58 to a square mile,) are forested or uncultivated. There were in the Holy Land no forests of any magnitude. Only nine are mentioned in the Bible, the largest of which were on their lofty mountains, Lebanon, Antilibanus, Ephraim, &c. The others, with the exception of Mahanaim where Absalom was killed, and Chorsa, which extended into the wilderness of Ziph, appear to have been either for ornament, or were boundaries between the tribes. Their fuel was composed of the gatherings of the fields and vineyards on the mountains, and of dried manure, (vid. Jahn,) and this was sufficient to warm them during their short and mild winter. With us trees grow so slowly that it requires nearly one half of the soil to be devoted to forest, to defend us against the extreme cold of this climate. This will forever prevent us from arriving at the same density of population with the inhabitants of Palestine. From the causes just mentioned they were enabled to cultivate every inch of soil, leaving only trees enough to adorn their grounds, and furnish them with fruit and shade. In connection with this they enjoyed all the improvements in agriculture, which grow out of a dense population. It is owing to this that the countries of the East, and particularly the region between the Tigris and Euphrates, supported such an immense population. It is their improvements in agriculture, particularly their great skill in irrigating their lands, that gave their fields the vivid green of spring during the long summer, which, bringing with it the easterly wind,

withered those plants which were not thus watered. It is this which makes Damascus and its environs, even to this day, look to the traveller as he approaches it like an emerald in the desert. We see that England, where the economy of agriculture is much inferior to that of the east while in its best state, is enabled to support a population of 190 to a square mile, and with ordinary crops to export a large amount of grain. Could the forests of New-England be removed, and our agriculture be improved even to the degree of perfection it is in England, we should cease to wonder, when we read that Joshua marched his two million seven hundred thousand Israelites, and settled them in the land.

4. As the land was divided among them, *every inhabitant had his own ground which he could cultivate as he pleased*. Whenever a people own the soil they labor upon, it will universally be tilled with much more pleasure, than when cultivated by slaves or peasants. Every man in Palestine was lord of the manor, and was always secured against the land's going out of his family, as every fiftieth year there was a universal freedom from debt, when not only their personal liberty, but their property was returned to them. Beside this, they had the power of recovering their freedom every seventh year after they became slaves, or sooner, if they chose to purchase it. This law, and particularly the one relating to the Jubilee, (Leviticus 25,) would forever prevent individual families from rising to great power and living in palaces surrounded by an abject peasantry, and agriculture from realizing the evils which grow out of such a state of society. Every man here had his own exclusive right to the soil; and however poor he may have been, cultivated as the ground was by the hand of freedom, it yielded its thirty and sixty fold.

5. *The Israelites rarely eat animal food unless at their festivals.*— Consequently they were not compelled

ed to appropriate large tracts of land to pasturage. Their best grounds were not devoted to the grazing of large herds of cattle, as in many of the beef-eating countries of Europe. It is true that they cultivated the soil with the aid of cattle or asses, but the number of these was limited. As oil manufactured from the olive was in a great measure a substitute for butter, they were not necessitated to devote large tracts of land to support herds to furnish them with this article. It is true that they had cattle, sheep, and camels, in great numbers; but they were all pastured east of Jordan and in the desert, either near the Asphaltic lake, in Edom, or east of Gilead. It was around the fountains which, springing up in the desert, spread luxuriance and beauty wherever they flowed, that the Israelitish Nomades pitched their tents and fed their numerous herds. That this desert was then highly valued, is evident from I Chron. v, 9, 10, where it is mentioned that the tribe of Reuben, having driven out the Hagarites, the former inhabitants, took possession of their land; the reason given is, *because their cattle were multiplied*. From this and several other places it would appear, that this wilderness was probably much more fertile formerly than at the present time. This we know is true of two large tracts in Persia, which are now comparatively deserts.* These herds were to them a great source of wealth, furnishing them with food and clothing. By thus feeding their cattle in the wilderness they could cultivate to a great extent the land which otherwise must have been devoted to grazing. They were enabled, by the increase of their flocks, to raise a great amount of wool for exportation, as in a country so warm as Palestine, it would require a very limited supply to defend them against the cold of their winters.

6. *Until after the time of David*

*The provinces of Khudistan and Khorasan.

the Israelites used no horses, neither in war nor for domestic use, unless we except the small number that David reserved for himself after the slaughter of the Moabites. The Philistines had cavalry in their armies, as they were of great service to them in the plain of Philistia. Sisera, in the time of Joshua, had 900 chariots of iron, which could be used with great effect in the large plain in which he fought with Barak. No mention is made of horses being introduced into Palestine before the victory over the Moabites, and it was not until the reign of Solomon that they were numerous. It is true that Samuel, in describing to the Israelites assembled at Ramah the manner of the king who should reign over them, says, *he will take your sons and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots*, I Sam. viii, 11; still from the histories of Saul and David, we must conclude, that he fixed his prophetic eye, on a period subsequent to their reigns. In the days of the Judges and Joshua, they were probably unknown, as no mention is made of them from the time when Moses composed his triumphal song over Pharaoh and his host, until the period just referred to, unless in connection with their enemies. This fact can be easily accounted for by the command so often given to hough the horses taken in battle, and by a statute in the Mosaic laws, Deut. xvii, 16, where the king whom they should afterwards choose is expressly forbidden to multiply horses to himself. This was doubtless enacted for two reasons. *First*, because the country they were to inhabit, was so mountainous that they could not advantageously use them in war; and *secondly*, to prevent them, as Moses expresses it, *from going down into Egypt*, and thus mingling with idolaters. By the observance of these commands, they were not as with us compelled to devote large tracts of land to support that noble animal.

These arguments are sufficient to

convince me that Moses not only did not exhibit any want of foresight in placing the Israelites between Gilead and the sea, and between Lebanon and the river of Egypt, but that this tract would have maintained even a larger number. But it will be said that the Israelites greatly increased until the time of David, when they amounted, (1 Chronicles xxi, 5, 6,) to 1,570,000 that drew the sword, beside Levi and Benjamin. There is here an excess over the return as given in the book of Samuel of 250,000 men; but I am perfectly willing to allow that the first result is accurate, and believe that if we glance at the situation and extent of Palestine at this time, we shall find no difficulty in allowing even this population. The tribes of Levi and Benjamin in the last census of Moses were as follows: In Benjamin 45,600 over twenty years of age, and in Levi 23,000 males over one month. If we suppose that 14,000 of these were over twenty which is allowing as large a number as my opponents will ask, we shall have 59,600 in these two tribes, or about one ninth as many as there were in the remaining tribes. If then to 1,570,000, we add one ninth, we shall have 1,744,444 thousand men that were able to draw the sword. This multiplied by three and a half, gives us 6,105,554 as the number of Israelites in the time of David; which is more than double the population in the time of Moses. Such a number could not be supported on so small a tract of land, as that originally occupied by the descendants of Israel. The history of this people will relieve us here from every difficulty on the subject. We find that in the days of the Judges the population became so dense, that they were obliged to extend their territory. A part of the tribe of Dan, being destitute of a place to dwell in, removed their possessions, and having conquered Laish, a Phœnician colony, settled there, and

remained masters of it until the captivity. This mode of extending their boundary by conquest was frequent, as we learn from I Chron. v, 10, 11, that the tribe of Reuben conquered the country of the Hagarites east of Gilead, and that afterwards this tribe, with Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh, extended their conquests on the east, driving out the Nomadic nations, the former inhabitants, before them, until they extended their boundary to the Euphrates, keeping possession of it until the captivity. The reason was, as we said before, that *their cattle were multiplied in the land*. The Euphrates was the boundary of the Israelitish kingdom in the time of David, as appears from I Chron. xviii, 3, where David is said to have smitten Hadarezer, as *he went to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates*. The dominion of Solomon was equally extensive,—‘from the river, (viz. the Euphrates, whenever the *article* is used,) unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Gath,’ I Kings iv, 24.

But David extended his kingdom still farther. On the *south*, he conquered several small tribes, viz. the Geshurites, the Gezerites, and the Amalekites, who remained after the slaughter of that nation by Saul, I Sam. xxvii, 8. Afterwards he extended his conquests through all Idumea, to the Arabian gulf, for that was the southern boundary of Edom, II Sam. viii, 14.

On the *west*, he humbled the Philistines, but still allowed them to live in their cities, on condition of their paying tribute. With the Phœnicians he continued at peace, but took on the coast north of Sidon, the city of Berothai, probably where Bairout is now situated. Vid. Michaelis.

On the *north*, he took Damascus which had been a place of magnitude from the time of Abraham, and the territory, of which that city was the metropolis. In the war with the king of Zobah, he extended

his conquests far into Syria. Here in the vallies between Libanus and Antilibanus, a new avenue was opened for the emigrating Israelites.

These were the principal changes produced by David in the extent of Palestine. If we take into view the great extent of Edom, Syria, Ammon, Moab, Amalek, &c., the northern boundary reaching far into Syria, and the western being washed by the Euphrates, we must conclude that David nearly doubled the extent of Palestine. And when we remember, that by conquering these nations, the Israelites were thus enabled to emigrate, that their shepherds were permitted to feed their flocks through the great eastern desert, and that all these nations paid their annual tribute to the Israelitish king, thus lessening the demands on his people—we must conclude that the kingdom of Israel in the reign of David, could support the population mentioned in the book of Chronicles. Palestine was never larger than in his reign, and he with his sword literally fulfilled the promise of God to Abraham, that his posterity should *inhabit from the great sea to the river Euphrates*.

CRITO.

For the Christian Spectator.

MESSRS. EDITORS,

IN the remarks on the influence of Christianity upon society, contained in your number for August, there is an allusion (page 411) to the directions given by the Emperor Julian to one of his pagan priests, respecting the expediency of imitating christian teachers in practising benevolence and charity, in shunning scenes of amusement, &c. &c. These are contained in a letter* written to Arsacius, High Priest of Galatia. The letter is a curious document, and possibly some of your readers may

* Ep. 49. See p. 429, Jul. Op. Ed. Spanheim, Fol. Lips. 1696.

be interested by a translation of those passages to which the above mentioned allusion refers.

'The gentile religion,' says he, 'does not flourish as we should desire, owing to the misconduct of those who profess it. Its affairs are indeed in a better condition than a little while since we dared to hope. But why are we satisfied with this? Why do we not observe what it is that has so much advanced the christian religion,—*philanthropy, regard to the rites of sepulture, and feigned sanctity of life.* To these things we ought strictly to attend. Nor will this be enough. I would have you either persuade or compel all the priests in Galatia to be diligent in their duty. Even deprive them of their sacred office, unless, with their wives and children and servants, they are sedulously devoted to the Gods. * * * Exhort them also not to visit the theatres, not to drink at public houses, not to pursue any secular occupation, nor engage in any dishonorable employment. Exalt such as regard these exhortations, and depose those who do not. Moreover erect hospitals in every city for the reception not only of our own poor, but of others who may be needy. * * * It certainly is a shame that we should neglect our own poor, while the impious Galileans support both theirs and ours. Teach the Hellenists, (pagans,) therefore, to make contributions for these purposes. Let the towns consecrate to the Gods portions of their yearly harvests. Form the people to a habit of such benevolent exertions.'

Julian bears similar testimony to the charity of the christians in other

writings, particularly in a fragment,* in which he undertakes to describe *what ought to be the character of a priest.* This piece deserves to be read by the christian minister.—A free translation of some parts of it may be found in Gibbon's Roman Empire.† W.

For the Christian Spectator.

"Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you."

How peaceful is the closing hour
Of summer day, so calm and still,
While modest eve, with blushes warm,
Glides pensive o'er the western hill.

How peaceful is the evening Lake
That spreads its mirror still and fair,
While pleased the peerless queen of
heaven,
Lingers to view her image there.

How peaceful to the eye of youth,
Is the bright path of future years,
While Hope, sweet syren, hides with
flowers
Each dark recess of woe and tears.

But storms will shroud the summer sky
And sweep the Lake ere dawning day,
And darker storms, with eddying whirl,
Will bear youth's fondest hopes away.

Yet still there is a blissful calm,
E'en here on earth to mortals given,
That cheers the heart, that changes not—
Sweet foretaste of the rest of heaven.

When hopes that dawned are sunk in night
And parted friends are wept no more—
When sighs are hushed, and sorrows
soothed,
And passion's troubled storm is o'er—

When the wrapt soul, serene and calm,
Rises in blest communion free,—
This peace, O God, my Hope, my Rest,
This perfect peace, is found in Thee!

C. D. D.

* See Jul. Op. p. 233.

† See Chap. 23.

Review of New Publications.

The Reports of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour in the United States.—1818, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.

(Concluded from page 494.)

We have no room to enlarge on

the political aspect of this subject. We will only ask—where would be the enterprise and the wealth and the strength of New-England, if her green hills and pleasant vallies were cultivated no longer by her own independent

ent and hardy yeomanry, but by the degraded serfs of a Polish aristocracy? And what would not Virginia become, if she could exchange her four hundred and twenty five thousand slaves for as many freemen, who, in blood and complexion, as well as in immunities and enjoyments, should be one with the proudest of her children?

But the mere politician cannot fail, in estimating the magnitude of this evil, to look at its moral tendency. The great men of the south have looked at it in this aspect, and have expressed themselves accordingly. Judge Washington pronounces it to be "an inherent vice in the community." Mr. Jefferson uses language on this subject, too strong for even a northern man to regard it as strictly true. In his Notes on Virginia, he says—"The whole commerce between master and slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other."—"The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in a smaller circle of slaves, gives a loose to his worst passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped with odious peculiarities."—"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep for ever."—And speaking of the probability, that the blacks may assert their freedom, he adds, "the Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest." It would be easy to collect the sentiments of many highly honored individuals in the southern States who have expressed themselves as decidedly if not as strongly. But it is enough to say in regard to the moral influence of the system on the blacks, that laws exist in nearly all the slaveholding States, prohibiting their instruction, and even driving them from Sunday schools, because the public safety requires them to be kept in

perfect ignorance; and in regard to its influence on the white population, that the most lamentable proof of its deteriorating effects may be found in the fact that excepting the pious whose hearts are governed by the christian law of reciprocity between man and man, and the wise whose minds have looked far into the relations and tendencies of things, none can be found to lift their voices against a system so utterly repugnant to the feelings of unsophisticated humanity—a system which permits all the atrocities of the domestic slave-trade—which permits the father to sell his children as he would his cattle—a system which consigns one half of the community to hopeless and utter degradation, and which threatens in its final catastrophe to bring down the same ruin on the master and the slave.

There are two considerations in view of which we ventured to remark that the slavery which exists in our country is more ominous in its character and tendency than any similar system which has ever existed in other countries. The first is that slavery contradicts the primary principles of our republican government. Slavery was not inconsistent with the principles of Grecian and Roman democracy. It is in perfect harmony with the systems of government, which, excepting Great Britain and Switzerland, prevail in every province of the old world from the Frozen Ocean to the Cape of Good Hope, and from the Bay of Biscay to the Pacific. But it stands in direct opposition to all the acknowledged and boasted maxims in which is laid the foundation of our political institutions. The other consideration to which we refer is, that which spreads terror over every aspect in which the subject can be viewed, and which seems to tell us—for all these evils there is no remedy. It is, the fact that the slaves, and those who have been slaves, and those whose fathers have been slaves, are all marked out and stigmatized with the brand which nature has stamped up-

on them. In Greece and Rome, as in almost every other nation, a slave might be made free, and then he was no longer a slave, but he was amalgamated with the rest of the community, and the road of wealth or honor or office was open before him, and his interests were united with the interests of the republic. But here the thing is impossible : a slave cannot be really emancipated. You cannot raise him from the abyss of his degradation. You may call him free, you may enact a statute book of laws to make him free, but you cannot bleach him into the enjoyment of freedom.

Now apply to this subject one very simple arithmetical calculation. In 1820 the slave population of the country was 1,500,000. Their annual increase is estimated at 35,000. Their number doubles in less than twenty years. Things remaining as they now are, in 1840 we shall have 3,000,000 of slaves,—in 1860, 6,000,000,—and in 1880, 12,000,000,—a nation of slaves larger by 4,000,000 than the whole present white population of the United States. What a state of things will this be. Twelve millions of slaves. ‘A nation scattered and peeled,’ ‘a nation meted out and trodden down ;’—and God forbid that it should be written in the blood and echoed in the groans of that generation—“a nation terrible from their beginning hither.” But even in the short sixty years which must elapse before such a state of things can take place, how much terror and anxiety must be endured, how many plots must be detected, how many insurrections must be quelled.

Plots ! and insurrections ! These are words of terror, but their terribleness is no argument against the truth of what we say. If things go on as they are words more terrible than these must be “familiar in our mouths.” For notwithstanding all that may be done to keep the slaves in ignorance, they are learning, and will continue to learn something of

their own power, and something of the tenure by which they are held in bondage. They are surrounded by the memorials of freedom. The air which they breathe is free ; and the soil on which they tread, and which they water with their tears is a land of liberty. Slaves are never slow in learning that they are fettered, and that freedom is the birthright of humanity. Our slaves will not be always ignorant—and when that righteous Providence, which never wants instruments to accomplish its designs, whether of mercy, or of vengeance, shall raise up a Touissant, or a Spartacus, or an African Tecumseh, his fellow slaves will flock around his standard, and we shall witness scenes—which history describes but from the thought of which the imagination revolts. Not that there is any reason to anticipate such an insurrection as will result in the emancipation of the slaves, and the establishment of a black empire. A general insurrection in the southern states, might indeed destroy their cities, might desolate their plantations, might turn their rivers to blood ; but to be finally successful, it must be delayed for more than two or three generations,—it must be delayed till the blacks have force enough to resist successfully the energies of the whole American people ; for at any time within sixty or a hundred years, the beacon fires of insurrection would only rally the strength of the nation, and the illfated Africans, if not utterly exterminated, would be so nearly destroyed that they must submit to a bondage more hopeless than ever.

Cannot the people of the United States be roused to an effort for the partial if not for the entire removal of the evils attendant on the circumstances of our black population ? We refer to *all* these evils ; though they cannot all be enumerated, for their name is legion. We refer to the condition of all the blacks whether bond or free. They are wretched, and their wretchedness ought to

be alleviated. They are dangerous to the community, and this danger ought to be removed. Their wretchedness arises not only from their bondage, but from their political and moral degradation. The danger is not so much that we have a million and a half of slaves, as that we have within our borders nearly two millions of men who are necessarily any thing rather than loyal citizens—nearly two millions of ignorant and miserable beings who are banded together by the very same circumstances, by which they are so widely separated in character and in interest from all the citizens of our great republic. The question is, cannot the people of the United States be induced to do something effectual for the removal of these evils? Without doubt they can be roused to an effort; for in a nation so far under the influence of christian principle as ours, there is a spirit which will answer to the voice of benevolence when it pleads the cause of humanity. It did answer in England, when Wilberforce and Clarkson lifted up their cry against the wrongs of Africa;—and the consequence of their unwearied labors has been the formal abolition of the slave-trade by every christian power in both continents, and such a total revolution in public sentiment, that all who are not immediately interested in the nefarious traffic are ready to denounce it as the most high handed outrage that ever was practised by fraud and power against simplicity and weakness. If the philanthropists of America will summon up their energies to a like effort—if they will never cease to warn their fellow-citizens of the extent and nature of these evils—if they will properly set before the public the political and intellectual and moral degradation of the blacks, and the danger which results from this degradation;—the same spirit which answered to the plea of Wilberforce will answer them, and the effect of their labors will be seen in the sympathiz-

ing efforts of all the enlightened and benevolent. We doubt not that the public may be excited on this subject, and if excited they may put forth such an effort as will alleviate the evils in question, and long delay, if not utterly prevent their final catastrophe. The excitement required is not a momentary, feverish, half delirious excitement, like that produced by the agitation of the Missouri question,—it must be something more calm and permanent. It must not be a sudden torrent passing away with the cloud that gave it birth; but a river whose broad, deep, peaceful streams are supplied by perennial fountains, and whose pure waters, like the waters of Jordan shall wash away from our national character this foul and loathsome leprosy.

But *what* shall be done? This excitement must have a definite object,—what shall that object be?—what kind of effort is demanded? We answer, *first*, any effectual effort for the benefit of the blacks must be such as will unite the patriotic and benevolent in all parts of the country. There is perhaps no subject which excites so much of what is called *sectional* feeling,—so much of jealousy at the south, so much of exultation at the north, and so much of indignant invective in all parts of the union, as the subject before us in any of its relations. But this feeling at the north and at the south, is equally unreasonable, not to say, equally criminal. The difference in regard to slavery and a negro population, between New-England and Georgia, we owe not to ourselves, or to our fathers but to the God who has placed our habitation where the climate forbade the introduction of Africans, and where the hard soil could be cultivated only by the hands of freemen. Had the rough hills, and the cold winds, and the long winters of New England been exchanged for the rich plains and the burning sun and the enervating breezes of Car-

olina, all the sacred principles of puritanism would not have prevented the introduction of slavery at a time when hardly a man could be found in either hemisphere to raise his voice against the enormity, and when England was determined to infect all her colonies with the debilitating and deadly poison. What occasion then can we have to exult over our fellow citizens? It is as if the heir to an estate should exult in the poverty of his neighbour. It is as if the man in health should glory over his brother in sickness. And it is with indignation that we sometimes see the editors of political journals in one part of the country, attempting to kindle and cherish such feelings;—for every such attempt excites and increases, and in some measure excuses that tetchy sensibility in respect to this subject which the people of the south are always too ready to manifest. But still we are happy to believe that notwithstanding all the vaporizing of newspaper declaimers, the great majority of the northern people regard the matter—at least in times of calm reflection—with far more enlarged, liberal, national feelings than is commonly imagined by their southern brethren. And we will even express our belief that there is hardly any enterprize to which the militia of Vermont or Connecticut would march with more zeal than to crush a servile rebellion (if such an event should ever take place with all its cruelties and horrors) in Virginia. The people of Maine belong to the same great community with the people of Georgia; and hence they desire at once the right and the duty of interfering to alleviate, and if possible to remove, an evil which affects the prosperity and safety of the whole American empire. The people of the south should know this, and if they once see their fellow citizens engaging calmly and kindly in real efforts for the alleviation of this

evil, their prejudices will be done away, and they will acknowledge the unseasonableness of their jealousies. If the people of New-England will talk less of the guilt of slavery, and more of the means of counteracting its political and moral tendencies; or if when they speak of its guilt, they would acknowledge that New-England is a partaker; if they will remember that it was their ships and sailors that carried the Africans in chains across the ocean, and that there are now men among them who are living on “the price of blood”—men whose wealth was “earned” by “sinews bought and sold”;—if they will speak of this subject with the modesty, and think of it with the shame which such remembrances are calculated to inspire, they may soon find that there are principles and schemes of enterprize in which the benevolent of all the states can unite: And would not a national effort for the removal of this national evil, do away local prejudices, and bind together the different parts of the union with a closer bond of national feeling?

An effort for the benefit of the blacks, in which all parts of the country can unite, of course must not have the abolition of slavery for its immediate object. Nor may it aim directly at the instruction of the great body of the blacks. In either case, the prejudices and terrors of the slave-holding states would be excited in a moment; and with reason too, for it is a well established point that the public safety forbids either the emancipation or the general instruction of the slaves. It requires no great skill to see that the moment you raise this degraded community to an intellectual existence, their chains will burst asunder like the fetters of Sampson, and they will stand forth in the might and dignity of manhood, and in all the terrors of a long injured people thirsting for vengeance.

But notwithstanding these restrictions, occasioned by the necessity of the case and the danger of exciting jealousy, the effort in question must be a *great* effort, great in its conception and great in its details. We mean that there must be a magnificence in its immediate object, and an attractiveness in every step of its progress, which will not let it be forgotten or overlooked among the numberless enterprises of the age. There is a certain simple grandeur in the design of the Bible Society, which fills the whole mind of the beholder, and awakens the benevolent heart to ecstasy as it contemplates the mighty scheme in all its relations. It is this which has united in the holy undertaking christians of every name and of every country, and it is this which will always unite them till the design of the Bible Society shall attain its perfect accomplishment. The Missionary Society with perhaps less of that imposing simplicity, in its place seizes on the attention and the affections of the public by the charm which is thrown over all its proceedings. Every new report of its progress, every letter from a distant missionary awakens in the supporters of the enterprise a higher joy, and a livelier interest. And it is this increasing brightness in the details of its progress, which will always make it fresh and beautiful to the benevolent eye, till 'the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord.' So any effort for the removal of the evils to which our attention has been directed, before it can become powerful and lasting, must have something of the same character. There must be a similar grandeur in its object to arrest the public attention; and to keep up that attention, there must be the same interest thrown over the successive events of its history. Without the one, the great body of the people will not engage in the enterprise; without the other, they will not maintain it.

We have asserted that the Colonization Society is the only institution which promises any thing great or effectual for the relief of our black population. We have examined the condition of that population, and have pointed out the characteristics of the effort which shall accomplish any thing for their improvement. To establish our assertion it remains for us to show that the direct object of this society is attainable; and that the two characteristics above mentioned belong to this scheme, and to this alone.

What other scheme, then, for the improvement of the blacks, is there before the public? What other efforts are we exhorted to make? What other projects do we hear of? There are a few sunday schools established for their benefit in our large towns; and in some of our cities the Africans have churches of their own, and tolerably well qualified ministers of their own. And more, to educate young men of colour for the work of the ministry among their brethren, there is, or there was, somewhere in the State of New-Jersey, an African seminary, with whose managers, funds, resources, students, instructors, and even local situation the public at large have been, for three years past, about as well acquainted, as they are with the course of the Niger, or the police of Tombuctoo. But efforts of this kind, taken by themselves, hardly amount to any thing; they do not in the least affect the essence of the evil; and not only so, but by a great part of the slave holders they are considered dangerous, and therefore they can never become such as will unite the patriotic and benevolent in all parts of the country. The same remark will apply with at least equal force to the projects of "the American Convention for promoting the Abolition of Slavery, and improving the condition of the African race," as set forth in an "Address to the people of the United States," which now lies before us, and which contains some calculations and suggestions

that ought to be familiar to every mind.

If then there is any hope of extensive good for these two millions of beings, it must be found in the plans proposed by the American Colonization Society. But before proceeding to examine how far this plan possesses the characteristics necessary to success, it is important to notice the objection, sometimes urged, that the establishment of a colony in Africa is impossible.

If a colony of free blacks cannot be established on the coast of Africa, it must be, either 1st, because free blacks cannot be induced to go, which is false, for they have gone, and hundreds are waiting to go,—or 2dly, because when they arrive there they cannot be defended from the natives, which is disproved by the late contest,—or 3dly, because the soil will not yield them support, which needs no answer to any man who will look into a book of travels,—or 4thly, because they must be cut off by the insalubrity of the climate, which is contradicted by the experience of the settlers, and by the testimony of travellers. It is contradicted by the experience of the settlers; for since they have occupied their present station they have been visited with no sweeping pestilence, excepting only the recent mortality among those sent out in the *Oswego*; the number of deaths among them has been no greater than the average mortality of the same class of people in America. It is contradicted by the testimony of travellers. If we had room for extracts, they might easily be collected from a variety of authors. The opinion of Lieutenant Stockton must suffice:—

“We have had an interesting cruise on the coast, from the shoals of the Great River to Cape Palmas: it was during the most unhealthy season, and under circumstances not the most flattering. Being in a small vessel, we were often exposed to heavy rains, and occasionally encountered great fatigue. Notwithstanding which, we have returned in good health, only regretting that our cruise was so short,

and that we accomplished so little of that which we promised ourselves. We had the fever on board, but in every instance it yielded to the skill of our surgeons.” “Under all these circumstances, I am bound to believe (my conclusions however are deduced from impressions rather than from unalterable opinions) that the horror for that coast, the hue and cry about the African fever, and the noise about the tornadoes, are but little else than a fable, generated by policy, listened to because wonderful, and propagated by the interested. As to the climate, it is true the air is warm, and I think a constant exposure to the sun must be very debilitating. The thermometrical observations of this vessel do not show that the temperature of the air has ever been above eighty-five degrees, measured by Fahrenheit’s thermometer; but as the country is seldom refreshed by a cool invigorating breeze, the heat is more uniform, and of longer duration, and from that cause I think arises its pestilence, and not from the immediate power of the sun.* The heat is not beyond bearing for a while, but from its constancy must overcome any human constitution that is unwarily exposed to it during any length of time without relief. The fever I think may be more readily avoided, and if taken is not so dangerous, and may be more easily destroyed than that which infects many places in our own country. The tornadoes, as I saw and felt them, are inconsiderable and harmless, in comparison with squalls met with on parts of the American coast at particular seasons of the year. We may have been particularly favored, and it is possible that all the dangers which persons are led to apprehend, do ordinarily possess that country. But I can assure you the fever has not assumed a living shape; the winds are not saturated with pestilence; that even on the coast of Af-

* Cape Montserado it will be remembered, is “steep and elevated towards the sea,” which “affords it the advantage of the sea breeze.”

rica oxygen forms a component part of the atmospheric air, and to inhale it is not certain death. We (for I think I am speaking the sentiments of my companions) respired as freely, and enjoyed generally as good health as any country could have supplied us with. After examination and reflection, I honestly believe that the climate presents all those obstacles which are the natural productions of a tropical soil uncleared and uncultivated, but that they will yield to proper precautions; and that nothing can prevent the consummation of your wishes but limited means, bad counsels, or feeble efforts."

It is not pretended that the climate of Africa is as healthy to a native of Connecticut as the country in which he was born. We say it may be compared in this respect with other tropical countries. Is Montserado more unhealthy than New Orleans or Havana? Yet these places have been colonized; and colonized with the men whose descendants it is proposed to carry back to the climate, to which, the constitution which they have inherited from their fathers, is adapted. Is it *impossible* to colonize Africa? And did the God of nature design that that continent, with all the luxuriance of its soil, and all the variety of its productions, should for ever remain a wilderness? The happy inhabitants of Sierra Leone may give the answer.

With these facts before us, then, we feel no hesitation in saying that this enterprise is practicable; and we say too that it possesses the two characteristics already described as essential to any permanent and effectual effort in behalf of the blacks. It is an enterprise in which *all parts of the country can unite*. The grand objection to every other effort is, that it excites the jealousies and fears of the South. But here is an effort in which the southern people are the first to engage, and which numbers many of their most distinguished men among its advocates and efficient supporters. But it promotes the *interests* of the

South. True; and must not every plan of the kind, which promises to do any good, favor the interests of that part of the country where the evil to be remedied presses with the most alarming weight? And does not this plan promote the interests of the *North* too? Are there not thousands of blacks in New-England? And do they add any thing to the good order and happiness of society? Or rather are they not, and must they not continue to be as a body, ignorant and vicious, adding more to the poor rates of the parishes in which they reside, than they do to the income of the government? And shall a cause, to which the good people of the South offer not only money, but in not a few instances the freedom of their slaves, languish because the people of the North refuse to come forward with their good wishes, and their prayers, and their most liberal contributions. It will not. We dare to predict that the time is not far distant when the North and the South shall unite in this work of charity, and when every new report of the prosperity of our colony will awaken the same joy in every benevolent heart from Portland to Savannah.

This leads us to remark on the second characteristic, namely, that it is a *great* enterprise. There is a grandeur in the conception of it like the grandeur of the Bible Society; and if properly supported, every step of its progress must be attended by the sympathies and prayers of all who feel or pray for the missionary. Said Samuel J. Mills to his companion, "Can we engage in a nobler effort? We go to make freemen of slaves. We go to lay the foundation of a free and independent empire on the coast of poor degraded Africa. It is confidently believed by many of our best and wisest men, that if the plan proposed succeeds, it will ultimately be the means of exterminating slavery in our country. It will eventually redeem and emancipate a million and a half of wretched men. It will transfer to Africa the blessings of religion

and civilization ; and Ethiopia will soon stretch out her hands unto God."

Such is the object. To comprehend in any degree its magnitude, we must look at it in its relation to the blacks of our own country, in its relation to the slave trade, and in its relation to the civilization of Africa. We might add the connexion it must have with American commerce, not only by affording a station at which our Indiamen might take in water and provision, in some important respects more conveniently than at the Cape Verde Islands ; but also by opening to our merchants, at no distant period, a lucrative trade in all the productions of the climate. But we can only take the rapid glance at this topic, which is presented in the following extract from the third report.

"Has not the single port of Sierra Leone exported, in one year, since the abolition of the slave-trade by England, a greater value than all western Africa, a coast of several thousand miles, yielded, exclusive of its people, for a like period anterior to that event ? When this abominable traffic shall have been utterly exterminated ; when the African laborer can toil secure from the treachery of his neighbor, and the violence of the man-stealer ; that continent will freight, for legitimate trade, those ships which now carry thither chains, fetters, and scourges, to return home with the bones, the sinews, the blood, and the tears of her children. Her gold, her ivory, her beautiful dyes, her fragrant, and precious gums, her healing plants and drugs, the varied produce of her now forsaken fields and lonely forests, will be brought by a joyous and grateful people, to the nations who, once their plunderers and persecutors, will have at length become their protectors, friends and allies."

Let us look more particularly at the Colonization Society first in its relation to the blacks of our own country. Leaving slavery and its subjects for the moment entirely out of view, there are in the United States 238,000 blacks denominated free, but whose freedom confers on them, we might say, no privilege but the privilege of being more vicious and miserable than slaves can be. Their condition we have attempted to de-

scribe, and the description may be repeated in two words—irremediable degradation. Now is there not to the benevolent mind something noble in the thought of ameliorating the condition and elevating the character of these 238,000 ? The Colonization Society will do this. It will open for these men an asylum, whither they can flee from the scoffs and the scorn to which they are exposed. It will restore them to a real freedom in the land of their fathers. It will give them all the privileges of humanity in the land for which their Creator designed them. And should it be unable to confer on all, the benefits it proposes, still it would do not a little for their improvement. By elevating the character of those who were transported to Africa, it would elevate in some degree the character of those who remained. It would set before them the strongest motives to industry, and honesty, and the acquisition of an honorable reputation. And here would be room for the other branches of benevolent exertion ;—here would be opportunity for sabbath schools and all the apparatus of religious instruction. And is this a work to be overlooked or despised ?

But we have a million and a half of slaves. The black cloud almost covers our southern hemisphere. It is spreading,—and extending,—and every hour its darkness is increasing. Now to dissipate this cloud ; to let in light, the pure unmingled light of freedom, on our whole land,—the prospect is too wide for our vision, the object too vast for our comprehension. Let us look then with a nearer view at a less magnificent object. There are men in the southern states, who long to do something effectual for the benefit of their slaves, and would gladly emancipate them did not prudence and compassion alike forbid such a measure, of which it is difficult to say whether it would injure most the comfort and happiness of the slaves, or the welfare of the community. Now to provide a way for these men to obey the promptings of humanity

while they at the same time confer an equal blessing on the slaves and on the community—is not this a great design? And if, inspired by their example another and another master should emancipate his slaves; and if in this way the subject should come to be discussed with new views and feelings; and if emancipation no longer useless and dangerous, should be no longer unpopular; and if the voice of public opinion at the south should thus, by degrees, declare itself louder and louder against the practice of slavery; till at last the system should be utterly abolished; till not “a slave” should “contaminate” our soil; till Africa, abused degraded Africa should stretch out her hands and pray for America;—if this should be so what a triumph would be achieved—what a glory would be shed on our country in the view of admiring nations. No wonder, then, that faith should be staggered, and benevolence overwhelmed at the prospect of a consummation so magnificent.

But the supposition of entire success in this plan, though it cannot be looked at without scepticism, is not absurd. The Society have from the first anticipated the co operation of the national and state governments. The states of Virginia, Maryland and Tennessee have expressed their approbation of the design, and have requested the national government to engage in it. The first of these states, it is believed, stands ready, as soon as Congress shall begin the work, to lend the most efficient aid in colonizing her own coloured population. Indeed we may say, that in all the northern part of that section of the country, the necessity of a grand and general effort is beginning to be felt, certainly by all intelligent reflecting men. If then, the Government of the United States should begin the work, and if the governments of the slave-holding states should, one after another, follow on, who shall set bounds to what might be accomplished. By the calculations in the second Report, which are certainly moderate, it appears that

250,000 dollars would transport the annual increase of the free blacks; and 2,000,000, or a capitation tax of less than twenty five cents on all the citizens of the United States, would transport the whole annual increase of bond and free. “The amount of duties collected on foreign distilled spirits, during each of the first six years of Mr. Jefferson’s administration, would defray the sum total of this expense, and furnish half a million of dollars, annually, to extinguish the principal, the capital stock, of the heaviest calamity that oppresses this nation.”—“And were the same duties charged in the United States, as in Great Britain, on the consumption of this fatal poison of human happiness, their nett proceeds would, in less than a century, purchase and colonize in Africa, every person of colour within the United States.” 2 Report p. 34.

Thus these two evils—the greatest that our country has ever known—might be made to counteract and destroy each other.

But, whether such expectations are chimerical or not, there is an immense object to be gained by the efforts of the Colonization Society in the entire suppression of the slave trade. This horrible traffic, notwithstanding its abolition by every civilized nation in the world except Portugal and Brazil, and notwithstanding the decided measures of the British and American governments, is still carried on to almost as great an extent as ever. Not less than 60,000 slaves, according to the most moderate computation, are carried from Africa annually. This trade is carried on by Americans to the American states. The assertion has been made in Congress by Mr. Mercer of Virginia, that these horrible cargoes are smuggled into our southern states to a deplorable extent. Five years ago, Mr. Middleton of South Carolina declared it to be his belief “that 13,000 Africans were annually smuggled into our southern states.” Mr. Wright of Virginia estimated the number at

15,000. And the cruelties of this trade which always surpassed the powers of the human mind to conceive, are greater now than they ever were before. We might, but we will not, refer to stories, recent stories, of which the very recital would be torment. The only way in which this trade can be speedily and effectually suppressed is the establishment of colonial stations in Africa, which shall guard and dry up the fountains of the evil. There is no slave-trade in the vicinity of Sierra Leone. Soon there will be none in the vicinity of Montserado. And when colonies shall be established at proper intervals along the coast, the slave-trade will exist only in the memory of indignant humanity. And is not this an object for benevolence to aim at?

But this is not all. The colony is to be a means of civilizing and christianizing Africa. Hitherto the extension of civilization, and, since christianity was established in the Roman Empire, the extension of christianity has been almost exclusively by colonies. Whence came the civilization of Greece? It was brought by colonies from Egypt. How was Italy civilized? By colonies from Greece. How was Europe civilized? By the Roman military colonies. Whence came the civilization of America? And is not that universal spirit of improvement which is springing up in Hindoostan occasioned, more or less directly, by the British conquests there, which have poured in thousands of Englishmen, who are in effect colonizing India? Two centuries hence the little band, who are now cultivating their fields and building their houses at Montserado, and spreading over the wilderness around them a strange aspect of life and beauty, may be remembered by the thousands of their descendants, with the same emotions with which the little band who landed at Plymouth two centuries ago, are now remembered by the thousands of New-England. We do

not fear to say, that to the friends of missions, the Colonization Society presents a loud and imperative claim. The advantage of the Moravian missions and of the modern missionary establishments in savage countries, is that they are in substance, little colonies. If you could carry from this country to the Sandwich Islands, a thousand civilized and educated natives, would you not think you had done much for Owhyhee? This is what can be done, and must be done for Africa.

And will there not be an interest in the progress of the work? Will it not be delightful to watch the advances of the morning; to see the light breaking in on one dark habitation of cruelty, and another; to see the shadows of heathenism fleeing away, and the delusions which have so long terrified the ignorant pagans, vanishing; to see one tribe after another coming to the light of Zion, and to the brightness of her rising; to see Ethiopia waking, and rising from the dust, and looking abroad on the day, and stretching out her hands to God, and the day light still spreading and kindling and brightening, till all the fifty millions of Africa are brought into the "glorious light and liberty of the sons of God"! Is there not enough in this to arrest the attention of the public, and to keep it fixed on this object with an untiring interest, till all shall be accomplished?

The Niger's sullen waves
Have heard the tidings,—and the orient
sun
Beholds them rolling on to meet his light
In joyful beauty.—I'ombât's spiry towers
Are bright without the brightness of the
day,
And Houssa wakening from his age-long
trance
Of woe, amid the desert, smiles to hear
The last faint echo of the blissful sound.

A few words more, and we have done. We had intended to notice one or two things in the management of this Society which might be amended. One is, they have not kept up a constant communication

with the public. The monthly reports of their treasury have not been published; and we have known very little of their proceedings but from their annual reports. Another deficiency appears to be—perhaps we judge incorrectly—a want of that energy and business-like regularity of operation which so characterize some of our northern benevolent institutions. Generally their colonists have arrived at the most unhealthy seasons of the year. We the more willingly curtail our notice of these defects, because we think we can see an evident improvement. They have issued proposals for publishing a periodical work, which we hope will be well supported by the public. And they have resolved, and they have called on the public to assist in executing the resolution, that if possible they will send three vessels with emigrants to Liberia this fall. We do earnestly hope that this call will be answered, and that the Board will be enabled to carry this design into execution, and by sending their settlers to Africa at the healthiest, instead of the most unhealthy season of the year, to ascertain whether the climate is actually so deadly as benevolent slave-traders and the other enemies of the scheme are fond of representing. The late unfortunate intelligence from Montserado, discouraging as it may be to the timid and heedless, ought to invigorate the friends of Africa. It has proved, what every body knew before, and what no man in his senses ever presumed to deny, that the climate of that coast, like other tropical climates, is dangerous to foreigners arriving at a certain season of the year. It has proved too that, whatever may be thought of one of the agents at the colony, the other is a man of sense and integrity—‘a man of business, and one who knows how to command.’

The public have expected from this plan, we will not say too great, but too immediate results. For ourselves, we expect to see repeated un-

toward events.—We do not anticipate any thing magnificent for twenty or fifty years to come. But christian benevolence is gifted to look into futurity.

Finally, if any thing is done it ought to be done *quickly*. If there are christians among us who intend to favor this object, let them do it without delay. We would venture to suggest to ministers of all denominations the propriety of laying before their people, sometime in the course of this month, the claims of an object so important to our country and to the human race, and soliciting their contributions. Let it be known on earth, let it be known in heaven, that America is awake on this subject—that her sons of every name and of every opinion are doing something for the emancipation and salvation of injured Africa.

A Hebrew Grammar, with a Praxis on select portions of Genesis and the Psalms. By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. A new edition, revised and enlarged. pp. 406. Andover, 1823.

It is no inconsiderable argument of the progress of Hebrew literature in the United States, that a second edition of this grammar has been called for within two years after the appearance of the first. This fact likewise affords evidence, not only of the extension of biblical learning among us, but also of a disposition among our scholars to pursue that thorough course of study, which this grammar prescribes. Of the general plan of this work, and of its particular merits, we gave some account in our notice of the first edition.* Of the present, we have little to add. The work appears to have undergone an entire revision, not only in the subordinate

*Christian Spectator for 1822, p. 196.

parts, but in its general structure. The parts are more distinct, the arrangement is more philosophical, and fewer cases occur, where subsequent explanations are referred to for the illustration of preceding statements. The author observes in his preface that, "every important part of his grammar has undergone an investigation *de novo*, independantly of any preceding grammar," and that "the present edition contains results in some important respects, and in a multitude of minor ones, which are drawn from no other source than the author's own experience and investigation." He refers his readers for evidence of the improvements he has made, to the sections upon the vowels and the vowel-changes; upon the classifications of the verbs and conjugations; upon several of the irregular verbs; upon the rules and order of declining nouns, and the accounts of the declensions themselves; upon the nature and consecution of the accents, in the appendix, and finally to the extent of the praxis at the close. In addition to this, the author has marked those sections and parts of sections, which should form the primary course of the student, and designated the recitations from day to day by an apportionment, which he has found in the course of his own experience, suited to learners of common abilities and commendable diligence.

We are not aware that any alterations have been made in this edition from the former, which are not in themselves for the better. The only complaint which we anticipate, will probably respect the difficulty of using the two editions in the same class. But it should be here recollected, that the improvements attempted by the author are such as have been suggested in his own course of instruction. They are not the results of fancy, but of experience. The author has brought his grammar into its present shape, by carefully noticing and supplying

the deficiencies of other grammars, in the course of his own studies, and especially in aiding the studies of others. This will be obvious to any one who has compared the two editions of his Hebrew Grammar. The latter will be found more exactly adapted to the purposes of instruction, more independent of the peculiarities of other grammarians, wrought into a more perfect whole, and, at the same time, to have lost nothing, but to have gained in the clearness and minuteness of its details. These remarks are intended for those, who may be disposed to think more of the difference of the two editions, than of the important fact, that we have now a much more complete grammar than before, and who are little aware of the gradual progress, which a work of this kind must have towards perfection.

We hope however to be indulged in expressing a wish, that this grammar may be hereafter subject to few variations; and would recommend to the author, and this without in the least disapproving of any thing we have noticed in his grammar just published,—that, in any future edition, he would keep in mind, a remark which Dr. Johnson, when speaking on an analagous subject has borrowed from Hooker, that "change is not made without inconvenience, even from worse to better. There is in constancy and stability, a general and lasting advantage, which will always over-balance the slow improvements of gradual correction."

We are pleased to see it announced in the preface to this grammar, that Mr. Gibbs' Hebrew Lexicon may be expected from the press in the course of the present year.

We would here add, that the lovers of sacred literature are under very great obligations to the Andover press for what it has already accomplished; and we learn that another work will soon be in a course of publication, which seems to merit no less encouragement than any of

its predecessors. A prospectus has just reached us from Andover of a new edition of the Greek Lexicon of Wahl, a work which appeared at Leipsic in 1822, and is intended for the use of higher schools and colleges, as well as of students in Theology. It gives the results of Schleusner and other Lexicographers in a more condensed form; but with sufficiently copious exemplifications, and with some improvements. The work will be comprised in a single octavo volume of from 700 to 800 pages.

Of this Lexicon we know nothing, except from the prospectus; of the qualifications of the author, however, for a work of this kind, we have some means of judging. Christian Abraham Wahl, the author of this Lexicon, is now senior pastor of Schneeberg in Saxony, and was, some years since, employed as the instructor of the upper classes in the Lyceum of that city. In 1820 he published a historical and practical introduction to the scriptures, intended as a manual for teachers in the higher schools, and for such persons as enjoy the advantages of a liberal education, but who cannot be expected to read the more voluminous

biblical works, which are calculated in their structure as well as their extent, rather for those exclusively devoted to theological pursuits. This introduction we have seen, and consider it as admirably adapted to the object in view. The author has given a popular summary of what is found in the works of Bauer, Bertholdt, Eichhorn, Hanlein, Herder, Planck, &c.—rejecting those details which belong more properly to professed students. We might not be willing to subscribe to all the opinions of Wahl, but we have no hesitation to say, he has shown himself to possess uncommon talents for condensing the opinions and speculations of others, and exhibiting them in a manner highly perspicuous, and in an attractive form. The Greek Lexicon, from the account which is given of it, appears to be executed on the same general plan, and is probably another in a series of works undertaken by the author, to bring down theological science from the forbidding heights of formal erudition, to the comprehension and relish of all who have any taste for literary research. As such, we think it a work which merits, and which, no doubt, will receive a liberal patronage.

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence.

Hon. John Pickering of Salem, Mass. has, with the aid of Mr. David Brown, nearly completed a *Grammar of the Cherokee Language*, which will furnish important assistance in systematizing the kindred dialects, viz. the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, &c.

Bonaparte's private library was lately sold in London. Most of the books had marginal notes in the emperor's own hand writing. The sale collected a large concourse of amateurs.

A process has recently been inven-

ted in Glasgow by which garments may be rendered perfectly impervious to rain. It consists in gluing two pieces of cloth together by a wash of caoutchouc, (or Indian rubber,) dissolved in a mineral oil. and then passing them through a rolling press.

The last letters received in England from the celebrated traveller Belzoni, who is now on an exploratory journey in Northern Africa, were dated at Fez. He was about setting out with a caravan for Tombuctoo.

COLLEGIATE RECORD FOR A. D. 1823.

COLLEGES.	Day of Com- mencement.	No. who were graduated.	Doctors of Medicine.	Names of Presidents.
Bowdoin College, - -	3 W. in Aug.	31	23	Wm. Allen, D. D.
Waterville College, Maine,	3 W. in Aug.	3		Rev. D. Barnes.
Dartmouth College, - -	3 W. in Aug.	34	17	Rev. Bennet Tyler.
Vermont University, - -	2 W. in Aug.	8		Rev. Daniel Haskell.
Middlebury College, - -	3 W. in Aug.	17	17	Joshua Bates, D. D.
Harvard University, - -	Last W. in Aug.	37	9	Jno. T. Kirtland, D. D.
Amherst College, Mass. -		4		Hem. Humphrey, D. D.
Williams College, - -	1st. W. in Sept.	7		Ed. D. Griffin, D. D.
Brown University, - -	1st. W. in Sept.	27	6	Asa Messer, D. D.
Yale College, - - -	2d. W. in Sept.	72	30	Jeremiah Day, D. D.
Hamilton College, - -	4th. W. in Aug.	33		Henry Davis, D. D.
Union College, - - -	4th. W. in July.	67		Eliphalet Nott, D. D.
Columbia College, N. Y. -	1st. Tu. in Aug.	29		Wm. Harris, D. D.
Nassau Hall, N. J. - -	Last W. in Sept.	37		Rev. Dr. Carnahan.
Pennsylvania University -		32		Rev. Dr. Beasley.
Dickinson College, Pa. -		19		J. M. Mason, D. D.
Western University of Pa. -	1st. F. in July,	3		
St. Mary's College, Md. -		5		
Washington College, Md.		4		
Hampden Sidney College, Va				Jonathan P. Cushing.
North Carolina University,	1 Th. in June.			Jos. Caldwell, D. D.
Columbia College, S. C. -	1st. M. in Dec.			Tho's Cooper, M. D.
Georgia University, - -	1 W. in Aug.	13		Rev. Dr. Waddell.
Transylvania University, -	2 W. in July.	32		Horace Holly, D. D.

Honorary Degrees.

BOWDOIN.—Nathan Parker, D. D.

DARTMOUTH.—Jeremiah Mason, Daniel Webster, and Levi Woodbury LL. D.

Elnathan Judson, and Parker Cleaveland, M. D.

George Edward Wales, and Henry B. Chase, A. M.

MIDDLEBURY.—John N. Henry, LL. D.

Bennet Tyler, Heman Humphry, and Henry Axtell, D. D.

HARVARD.—William Eustis, Dudley Atkins Tyng, and George Bliss, LL. D.

Charles Lowell, and Moses Stuart, D. D.

John Bartlett, Nathaniel Miller, and William Whitbridge, M. D.

WILLIAMS.—John H. Church, and Giles H. Coles, D. D.

BROWN.—Tristram Burges, and Nathaniel Searle, LL. D.

Nathaniel Hendrick, and Adoniram Judson, D. D.

Sylvester Holmes, A. M.

YALE.—James Hillhouse, Noah Webster, Stephen Titus Hosmer, and Levi Hedge, LL. D.

James M. Matthews, D. D.

Jared Andrews, and John Torrey, A. M.

Josiah Fuller, Austin Olcott, Silas Fuller, and I. I. Hough, M. D.

HAMILTON.—Hermanus Bleeker, and Daniel Kellog, A. M.

Wm. O'Donnell, A. B.

COLUMBIA, N. Y.—Ambrose Spencer, John Savage, and Edward Livingston, LL. D.

Chauncey Lee, and John S. Ravenscroft, D. D.

UNION.—Nathaniel W. Taylor, Jonathan Wainright, and William McMurray, D. D.

Erastus Root, James Murphey, and James Youngs, A. M.

TRANSYLVANIA.—John Rowan, Jacob Burnett, and Hugh L. White, LL. D.
James Fishback, D. D.

PHI BETA KAPPA Anniversaries.—Orators and Poets.

DARTMOUTH.—Alpha of New-Hampshire.—RUFUS CHOATE, Orator.

YALE.—Alpha of Connecticut.

HARVARD.—Alpha of Massachusetts.—Mr. FULLER, Orator ; and Mr. BANCROFT, Poet.

UNION.—Alpha of New-York.—DE WITT CLINTON, Orator.

List of New Publications.

RELIGIOUS.

A Sermon, delivered in Boston, before the Convention of Congregational Ministers in Massachusetts, May 29. 1823. By Leonard Woods, D. D. Lincoln & Edmonds, Boston.

Sermons for Children. By Rev. Samuel Nott, Jr. Second Edition. New-York, 1823. J. P. Haven.

A Discourse, delivered at Danvers, Mass. June 24, 1823, before Jordan Lodge, Danvers; Essex Lodge, Salem; Philanthropic Lodge, Marblehead; and Mount Carmel Lodge, Lynn. By Joseph Emerson, Principal of the Female Seminary, and Minister of the Church in Saugus. 20 cents.

The Duty of Christians to the Jews. A Sermon, delivered at the annual meeting of the Palestine Missionary Society, in Halifax, Mass. June 18, 1823. By Daniel Huntington, A. M. of North Bridgewater. 20 cents.

A Discourse delivered June 4, 1823. at the ordination of the Rev. Christopher Marsh as pastor of the Church and Society in Sanford, Me. By Rev. Asa Rand.

A Sermon preached at the organization of the third Presbyterian Church in Charleston, S. C. By the Rev. A. W. Leland, D. D. Charleston, 1823.

Sermons on various subjects of Christian doctrine and duty. By Nathaniel Emmons, D. D.—Providence, R. I. J. Hutchins, 1823.

A Sermon delivered at the Funeral of the Hon. John Treadwell Esq. for-

merly Governor of the State of Connecticut, who died August 18, 1823. By Rev. Noah Porter, Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Farmington, Conn. Hartford, G. Goodwin, 1823.

A Reply to a second letter to the author from the Right Rev. Bishop Hobart, with remarks on his hostility to Bible Societies, and his mode of defending it; also on his vindication of the Rev. Mr. Norris' late pamphlet. By William Jay. John P. Haven, 8vo.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A Discourse delivered at Schenectady, N. Y. July 22, A. D. 1823, before the New-York Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa. By the Hon. De Witt Clinton, LL. D. Second Edition; A. H. Maltby & Co. New-Haven, Conn.

Suggestions on Education; relating particularly to the method of instruction commonly adopted in Geography, Grammar, Logic and the Classics. By William Russell. A. H. Maltby & Co. New-Haven, Conn.

WAR; a Poem, in three parts. By Samuel Webber, M. D. Boston, 1823. J. B. Russell.

A year in Europe, in 1819 and 1820. By John Griscom, 2 vols. 8vo. New-York, 1823.

Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Vol. 3d. Philadelphia, 1823.

The Genius of Obkvion, and other original Poems. By a Lady of N. Hampshire. Concord, 1823. J. B. Moore.

Religious Intelligence.

Exercises at the Annual Examination of the Theological Seminary at Andover, Sept. 24, 1828.

DEPARTMENT OF SACRED LITERATURE—JUNIOR CLASS.

Recitations in Hebrew and Greek.

Dissertations and Exegeses.

1. In order fully to understand the meaning of the Scriptures, is it essential that we should enter into the moral and religious sympathies of the sacred writers?—J. Maltby.

2 Exegesis of John 3 : 58.—W. Colton.

3. Exegesis of Luke 22 : 30.—A. Towne.

4. Has the second Psalm a double sense?—T. Hinsdale.

5. Are the Psalms prophetic throughout; and if not, of what use are they at the present day?—G. Howe.

6. Exegesis of John 16 : 8—11.—I. Rogers.

7. Do the principles of sacred exegesis require us to believe that the Demons of the New Testament are real existences?—D. S. Southmayd.

8. Must the ultimate appeal, in matters of controversy respecting doctrines that are revealed, be made to the principles of sacred exegesis?—S. M. Worcester.

9. Use of the study of Sacred Interpretation.—G. C. Beckwith.

10. Abuse of the study of Sacred Interpretation.—J. Todd.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY—MIDDLE CLASS.

1. What is evangelical faith?—F. Griswold.

2. On faith as a principle of action.—O. Pearson.

3. *On the perfection of God's word, as a rule of faith.—M. P. Braman.

4. On the perfection of God's word, as a rule of duty.—S. Barrett.

5. The christian doctrine of justification.—E. G. Howe.

6. Moral tendency of the doctrine of justification by faith.—J. Sherer.

7. Is repentance to be urged upon sinners as their immediate duty?—S. Russell.

8. On repentance, as a duty of christians.—W. Case.

9 *Principal errors of Pelagianism.—I. Esty.

10. In what sense are any of the doctrines of revelation incomprehensible?—P. Chase.

11. Did Christ die for all men?—S. Marsh.

12. The state and prospects of those who come to their dying beds without religion.—J. P. Payson.

13. The progress of evangelical truth and piety in the christian world for the last 30 years—S. L. Pomeroy.

14. What grounds have we to expect that the truth will ever prevail?—J. Richards.

15. Moral influence of the doctrine of the atonement.—R. Shepard.

16. *The duty of seeking the glory of God.—E. N. Sill.

17. Is the existence of natural affections consistent with the total want of holiness?—E. Maltby.

18. How are we to understand the Scripture account of evil spirits?—R. Landfear.

19. Effects of Fanaticism.—H. Sessions.

20. The consistency of general benevolence with the private duties.—L. Hall.

21. On the practice of using weak or inconclusive arguments to support the doctrines of the gospel.—O. P. Hoyt.

22. Will the punishment of the wicked be without end?—W. W. Hunt.

23. Can it be regarded as a fault in the divine administration, that all men are not saved?—D. Lancaster.

24. Moral tendency of the Scripture doctrine of future punishment.—J. Smith, 2d.

25. *Proof of a future state from the Pentateuch.—E. C. Tracy.

26. The proper use of reason in religion.—R. Washburn.

27. The Scripture doctrine of the dependence of Christians on the influence of the Holy Spirit.—C. Burbank.

28. The deference due to uninspired men in forming our religious opinions.—S. H. Cowles.

29. Doctrine contained in the passage, Acts x, 34. "God is no respecter of persons."—W. Withington.

30. On the importance of union among the followers of Christ.—J. Noyes.

31. The Scripture doctrine of the as-

sistance of the Holy Spirit in prayer.--
O. S. Hinckley.

32. On the faithful declaration of the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, as an expression of Christian love.—G. Cowles.

33. The evils of a skeptical state of mind.—H. Jones.

34. On the value of revivals of religion.—J. I. Foote.

35. What view of Christ's character agrees best with the religious affections of good men, as set forth in the Scriptures?—O. Eastman.

36. The comparative value of occasional excitement of feeling and habitual practice, as an evidence of regeneration.—E. Palmer.

37. Moral tendency of the Scripture doctrine of future rewards to the obedient.—J. Smith, 1st.

38. The criminality of rejecting the truth.—J. P. Taylor.

39. On the present agency of God in the material and spiritual world.—N. Bouton.

40. The warfare in the Christian's mind distinguished from that of sinners.—Z. Rogers.

41. Does God's promise to hear prayer, imply that he will, in every instance, grant the particular favour, which Christians ask?—F. E. Cannon.

42. On the desire of exploding old opinions.—S. Foster.

SACRED RHETORIC.—SENIOR CLASS.

1. Narrative style of the Bible.—J. H. Breck.

2. Influence of the Clergy in Catholic countries.—J. L. Burnap.

3. Abstract preaching.—B. F. Clarke.

4. Remarks on I Cor. ii, 2. "I determined not to know any thing," &c.—E. Frost.

5. Unity in Sermons.—J. C. Goss.

6. Examination of Longinus on the sublime.—W. L. Buffett.

7. Remarks on Sheridan's Lectures.—G. Sheldon.

8. On written sermons.—J. Hyde.

9. Unwritten sermons.—J. Oaks.

10. The preaching of Bates.—J. Kimball.

11. On the public reading of psalms and hymns.—S. Worcester.

12. Transition in sermons.—M. Chase.

13. *Influence of emotion on the countenance.—H. A. Parsons.

14. Illustration in sermons.—E. Gridley.

15. Egotism in the pulpit.—G. P. King.

16. Preaching of Chrysostom.—W. W. Niles.

17. The study of Hebrew Literature as modifying oratorical and poetical genius.—S. Peck.

18. Preaching of the Puritans.—N. W. Fiske.

19. Circumstances of the age demanding high qualifications and efforts in the preacher.—C. Isham.

20. Influence of ministers on national happiness, with the Valedictory Address.—L. Bacon.

*Absent or excused on account of ill health.

DONATIONS TO RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

The Treasurer of the United Missionary Society acknowledges the receipt of \$284 34 during the month of August.

The Treasurer of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, acknowledges the receipt of \$3,002 52, and several articles of clothing from the 13th of July to the 12th of August.

The Treasurer of the American Education Society acknowledges the receipt of \$604 27 during the month of August.

Ordinations and Installations.

June 4.—The Rev. Messrs. JOHN M. GARFIELD and LEMUEL B. HULL, were admitted to the order of priests, at Meriden, Conn. by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Brownell.

July 31.—The Rev. JOSEPH D. WICKHAM, was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian church in Oxford, N. Y.—Sermon by the Rev. Edward Andrews, of Norwich.

Aug. 5.—The Rev. GEORGE W. DOANE, was admitted to the order of

priests, and Rev. CORNELIUS R. DUFFIE, to the order of deacons in the City of New-York, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hobart.

Aug. 7.—The Rev. RUFUS BAECKOCK, jun. was ordained Pastor of the Baptist Church in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Aug. 12.—The Rev. DANIEL W. LATHROP, was ordained, at Bloomfield, N. J. as a missionary, to be employed in the State of Ohio, in the ser-

vice of the Conn. Miss. Soc.—Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Fisher.

Aug. 19.—The Rev. JOHN BLATCHFORD, was ordained Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Pittstown, N. Y.—Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Romeyn, of New-York.

Aug. 20.—The Rev. JOHN LUDLOW, was installed Pastor of the North Dutch Church in Albany, N. Y.—Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Yates of Union College.

Aug. 20.—The Rev. MAURICE W. DWIGHT, was ordained Pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church in Waterford, N.Y.—Sermon by the Rev. J.D. Fonda.

Aug. 27.—The Rev. MOSES THACHER, was ordained Pastor over the Congregational Church and society in Wrentham, Mass.—Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Thompson of Rehoboth.

Aug. 28.—The Rev. PETER LUDLOW, was ordained Pastor of the second Baptist Church in Providence, R. I.—Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Gano, of Providence.

Sept. 4.—The Rev. SAMUEL NOTT, was installed Pastor over the Presbyterian Church in Galway, N. Y.—Sermon by the Rev. Mark Tucker, of Stillwater.

Sept. 12.—The Rev. SENECA WHITE, was ordained over the first Congregational Church and Society in Bath, Me.—Sermon by the Rev. Eliphallet Gillet, of Hallowell.

Sept. 24.—The Rev. WILLIAM D. SNODGRASS, was installed Pastor over the Presbyterian Church in Murray Street, N.Y.—Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Macauley.

View of Public Affairs.

FRANCE AND SPAIN.—The war in the peninsula has alternately excited the hopes and the fears of our countrymen. This war will always be regarded as the most unprincipled aggression ever made upon the rights and liberties of an independent nation. Were the United States not separated from Europe by the intervening ocean, the vengeance of the Holy Alliance, which is now pouring out upon Spain, might fall equally upon us.

In respect to a termination of the contest favourable to Spain, our hopes have never been sanguine. In Catalonia, Mina has carried on an active and harassing warfare; faithful to the constitution of his country, he has incessantly watched the motions of the enemy, inspired the wavering and timid among the patriots, with courage and resolution, and spread terror and dismay among his foes. He is said to have visited also many parts of Spain with a single servant, encouraging the friends of the Constitution, organizing their force, reviving their hopes, and inspiring the irresolute with new hopes.

The English general, Sir Robert Wilson who has embarked in the service of the Spaniards, has discovered an heroic ardour in the cause. Should these brave men perish in the struggle, they will leave to posterity a bright example of devotion to the cause of liberty;—an example which will shine with increased splendour when their characters are contrasted with those of Abisbal, Morillo, Ballasteros and many others

who have treacherously deserted either to the French or to the Spanish Regency.

The King and Cortes having first fled from Madrid to Seville, and from thence to Cadiz, are now besieged in the latter place; while a French squadron is also blockading the port. It seems to be generally supposed that Cadiz is so fortified by nature and art, as to be incapable of being taken by the French, provided the besieged can be furnished with provisions; and as yet there seems to have been no great difficulty in eluding the blockade and supplying Cadiz with every thing essential for its support.

Notwithstanding the treachery of the Spanish generals, and notwithstanding the influence of the Spanish clergy, and their exertions to restore the ancient abuses, civil and religious, we think the great body of the Spanish nation, decided friends to the constitutional cause, and should the Cortes remain faithful to themselves and the country, the people may again be roused from their lethargy, and the same spirit which drove Joseph Bonaparte from the throne, may be again successful, and the invaders be driven with shame to their own country.

GREECE.—The last Number of the Quarterly Review contains an essay upon the state of the Greeks, their present condition, and the progress and probable result of the arduous struggle in which they are engaged. We will

not deny our readers the pleasure which they will experience in perusing the eloquent conclusion of this essay:—

“It cannot then, we think, reasonably be doubted, that the Greek nation, so constituted, will be able to maintain its independence, and gradually to advance from tranquility to enterprize, from enterprize to wealth, from wealth to power. She will have all the vigor of an infant state, with the additional advantage of having known the bitterness of adversity, and she will possess all the elastic activity of first civilization which the experience and variety of fortune have presented to her. The consciousness of freedom, the inexpressible delights of security of possession will give an impulse to the exertions of the natives, which will soon branch out into every channel of speculation. With wealth and power,—morality, religion and sound knowledge will also revive. We brand the unfortunate Greeks with every term of opprobrium for their want of good faith, for their superstition, and for their ignorance, and the cruelties which they have, in their present warfare, exercised against their oppressors, when they have had the power of retaliation, and they have been adduced as reasons why they should be left to themselves as utterly unworthy of the co-operation of civilized Europeans. We do not wish to deny their guilt, we do not stand forth as the apologists for the bloody vengeance with which they have visited their tyrants, but what cannot be defended may be palliated by the consideration of the peculiar aggravation under which they acted.—Men whose sires and grand sires have delivered down to them the appalling tradition of miseries which they had suffered from their Ottoman masters; who had themselves participated in those sufferings, and who are, at this moment, groaning under anguish increased far beyond the intensity of any former period; men who had beheld the common privileges, the sacred rights of human nature constantly and grossly outraged in the persons of themselves and families, each of whom could, perhaps, number by the days of his life, the insults and injuries which the barbarians, whom he was compelled to serve, had inflicted on himself, his wife, or children; surely such men should be treated with indulgence, if,

when a moment presented itself for acquitting this long and dreadful scene of atrocity, they anticipated the course of legal punishment, and by too summary a process took that retribution into their own hands, which should be executed only by public justice.

Let us then (we are authorized by the probabilities of practical calculation) indulge in the animating idea, that Greece will again be free. Let us contemplate her with all the natural and acquired advantages of which we have above sketched an outline, advanced to her proper station amidst independent nations, a maritime republic, a confederated state, the abode of enterprize, of knowledge, of morality, of liberty. Let us present her to our imagination, arrayed in the glory of the past and the admiration of the present times, deriving from ancient recollections an incentive to future exertion, and forming to the proselyte of ancestral renown her own thoughts and actions.—It is impossible to calculate the extent of the power, and prosperity, and fame which Greece, under such circumstances, might acquire. We know not where to fix the limits of human capacity and improvement in ordinary cases; and where should we presume to assign boundaries to a people restored at once from ages of sorrow and suffering, to the full enjoyment of freedom, placed in a territory of beauty, of which even their own poets, in their own immortal verse, have failed to convey an adequate idea; enjoying the luxuries of climate and the convenience of maritime intercourse, more than most spots of the globe; endowed with talents of enterprize and speculation, to take the completest advantage of all these natural treasures, and finally gifted with that genius and imagination which can alone preserve the commercial character from grossness, and elevate the calculation of worldly prudence, to the purity of intellectual refinements? In other countries, some of these gifts of fortune may be apparent, but Greece alone enjoys an union of them all. The sky in other climes may be as serene, the produce of other soils as luxuriant, the facilities of commerce on other shores as important, the talents of the nations of other countries as undisputed; but where shall we find all these ingredients of individual and political happiness united,

and moreover sanctioned (if we may so express ourselves) by that spirit of the past, which breathes its notes of sympathy and reminiscence over her seas, her mountains, her groves, and her temples?

To conclude—Greece will, we firmly hope, accomplish her own independence; her moral and mental emancipation we trust she may receive from Great Britain. To this country she looks as to her natural protector; and we ourselves, amidst the ruins of Athens, have listened to those representations which the poor debased Greek, in the full confidence that every Britain must sympathise with his woes, has uttered to move our pity. The appeal was deeply affecting, not from the power, but from the weakness of the speaker; not from the unison of his sentiments with the present, but from their contrast with the past. It was not a moment of triumph for them to whom the appeal was made; there was no consolation in the idea, that a descendant of the illustrious people, who had created the wonders which appeared on every side, stood a suppliant to the children of a race which at that time was removed only a few degrees from barbarism. It was not with emotions of exultation, that we reflected upon the change which two thousand years had caused in the relative situation of the two countries. The beautiful temples, where the sons of genius and heroism had assembled, lay broken into fragments at our feet; forms which seemed to breathe in marble, had been shattered by the hand of time and of ignorance; arches and porticoes arose in majesty, not over warriors and statesmen, but above the

path of the goat-herd and his flocks; in the area where assembled multitudes had listened to matchless eloquence, on the very steps where the master-hand had embodied into perfect language, irresistible argument, the dull despot of the country reclined in solitary stupidity; the streams on which poetry and philosophy had chaunted or meditated, were dry; the ports whence had issued triumphant navies, were deserted; and even the tombs of those who were contemporary with these achievements, lay open before us, to satisfy the curiosity or reward the avarice of the casual traveller. All this appeared to our contemplation whilst we were conscious that the fanes and altars of our own country were entire, her senate house filled with the echoes of free and enlightened debate, her ports and rivers crowded with the vessels of commerce, and the sepulchres of her children unpolluted. Nothing could so irresistibly press on the mind the mutability of human greatness; nothing could so feelingly make us tremble for the future fortunes of our native land; nothing could so effectually soften any insensibility we might have had to the sufferings of a fallen and degraded nation.

Yes, that nation has fallen, is degraded, but she is not irreclaimable. Her misfortunes are not to be reckoned as her crimes. She is weighed down by a load of oppression, and all her energies, her virtuous hopes, her moral qualities are compressed into inaction; but if the incumbent weight be removed, they may yet revive,—again bear the blossoms of civilization, and once more ripen into beauty."

Answers to Correspondents.

R.; J. A.; E. E*****; O. ERATOI; LEGULEIUS; and two pieces by H. are received.

A. B. C. and M. are under consideration.

¶ In consequence of an unusual press of matter, the continuation of the review of Orme's Life of Owen is unavoidably postponed to the next number. For the same reason, the department of Religious Intelligence is very much curtailed.

Erratum.—Last Number, p. 456.—Transpose the line, *Then all the multitude kept silence*, from the top of the 1st column to the bottom of the 2d column.